FAMILY OF FAITH
LIBRARY

REFERENCE MATERIAL
Do not Remove
from the Library

REFERENCE MATERIAL
Do not Remove
from the Library

Property of
FAMILY OF FAITH
LIBRARY

PHILOSOPHIA ULTIMA

OR

SCIENCE OF THE SCIENCES

VOL. I.

AN HISTORICAL AND CRITICAL INTRODUCTION TO
THE FINAL PHILOSOPHY AS ISSUING FROM
THE HARMONY OF SCIENCE
AND RELIGION.

BY

CHARLES WOODRUFF SHIELDS, D.D., LL.D.,

PROFESSOR IN PRINCETON COLLEGE.

THIRD EDITION.

ABRIDGED AND REVISED.

NEW YORK:
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS.
1888.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1877, by
SCRIBNER, ARMSTRONG & CO.,
In the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.

Copyright 1888, by
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS.

WM. F. FELL & CO.,
PRINTERS,
PHILADELPHIA.

ADVERTISEMENT

OF THE

THIRD EDITION.

The suggestion has been made by competent critics of this treatise, hitherto entitled the "Final Philosophy," that its main purpose might be better served by issuing it in an abridged and more popular form. In thus adapting it to the general reader, the author has found that certain omitted portions really belong elsewhere in his general scheme, as it was at first published, and should form substantive parts of it rather than mere introductory features. Accordingly, such passages have been re-cast and transferred to their proper place in a second volume which is now passing through the press.

The forthcoming volume will treat directly of *The Science of the Sciences*, or first part of PHILOSOPHIA ULTIMA as outlined in the original essay in the closing chapter of this volume.

THIS WORK

IS LASTINGLY ASSOCIATED

IN THE MIND OF THE AUTHOR

WITH THE SUSTAINING COURAGE AND FAITH

OF HIS WIFE,

ELIZABETH KANE,

IN WHOM SHONE

WITH WOMANLY GRACE AND NOBLEST CULTURE

ALL THAT MADE THE NAME OF

HER HEROIC BROTHER

ILLUSTRIOUS.

"*AS these great things are not at our disposal, we here, at the entrance of our work, with the utmost fervency and humility, put forth our prayers to God, that remembering the miseries of mankind and the pilgrimage of this life, where we pass but few days and sorrowful, He would vouchsafe through our hands, and the hands of others, to whom He has given the like mind, to relieve the human race by a new act of His bounty. We likewise beseech Him, that what is human may not clash with what is divine; and that when the ways of the senses are opened, and a greater natural light set up in the mind, nothing of incredulity and blindness towards divine mysteries may arise; but rather that the understanding, now cleared up, and purged of all vanity and superstition, may remain entirely subject to the divine oracles, and yield to faith the things that are faith's: and lastly, that expelling the poisonous knowledge infused by the serpent, which puffs up and swells the human mind, we may neither be wise above measure nor go beyond the bounds of sobriety, but pursue the truth in charity.*"

Bacon: INSTAURATIO MAGNA.

PREFACE.

In the present age there has been a seeming conflict between science and religion; but their essential harmony may still be sought upon philosophical principles, and as itself affording the one last philosophy, or theory and art of perfect knowledge.

With this object in view, the author, in the year 1861, issued a brief essay entitled *Philosophia Ultima*, together with a corresponding scheme of academic studies; and in pursuance of that scheme, in the year 1865, a chair of instruction was secured in the College of New Jersey, through the generous and intelligent sympathy of some friends in Philadelphia, of whom should here be named the late Rev. Doctor William M. Engles, Mr. George W. Childs, Mr. Anthony J. Drexel, and the Hon. Furman Sheppard.

The present volume may be regarded as the first-fruits of an educational experiment thus begun, and for a time successfully pursued. But it also contains philosophical opinions and doctrines .which are of more general interest, and it may,

therefore, be judged upon its own merits by the wider public to which it is now offered.

In the last chapter will be found the second half of the original Essay as yet to be expanded in a second volume, for which the author has long been accumulating materials; while the construction of the final philosophy itself, it need scarcely be said, can only be the common work and reward of many minds through coming generations.

October, 1877.

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

PAGE

THE ACADEMIC STUDY OF CHRISTIAN SCIENCE, ... 3–23

PART I.

THE PHILOSOPHICAL PARTIES AS TO THE RELATIONS BETWEEN SCIENCE AND RELIGION.

CHAPTER I.

EARLY CONFLICTS AND ALLIANCES BETWEEN SCIENCE AND RELIGION, OR THE HISTORICAL CAUSES OF THEIR PRESENT DISTURBED RELATIONS, ... 27–51

CHAPTER II.

MODERN ANTAGONISM BETWEEN SCIENCE AND RELIGION, OR THE BATTLES OF INFIDELS AND APOLOGISTS IN EACH OF THE SCIENCES, IN PHILOSOPHY AND IN CIVILIZATION, ... 52–94

CHAPTER III.

MODERN INDIFFERENTISM BETWEEN SCIENCE AND RELIGION, OR THE TRUCES OF SCIOLISTS AND DOGMATISTS IN THE SCIENCES, IN PHILOSOPHY AND IN CIVILIZATION, ... 95–132

CHAPTER IV.

MODERN ECLECTICISM BETWEEN SCIENCE AND RELIGION, OR THE EXPLOITS OF RELIGIOUS ECLECTICS IN THE SCIENCES, IN PHILOSOPHY AND IN CIVILIZATION 133–209

PAGE

CHAPTER V.

MODERN SCEPTICISM BETWEEN SCIENCE AND RELIGION, OR THE SURRENDERS OF RELIGIOUS SCEPTICS IN THE SCIENCES, IN PHILOSOPHY AND IN CIVILIZATION, ... 210–242

PART II.

THE PHILOSOPHICAL THEORY OF THE HARMONY OF SCIENCE AND RELIGION.

CHAPTER I.

THE UMPIRAGE OF PHILOSOPHY BETWEEN SCIENCE AND RELIGION 245–286

CHAPTER II.

THE POSITIVE PHILOSOPHY, OR THEORY OF NESCIENCE AS IGNORING REVELATION, ... 287–314

CHAPTER III.

THE ABSOLUTE PHILOSOPHY, OR THEORY OF OMNISCIENCE AS SUPERSEDING REVELATION, ... 315–345

CHAPTER IV.

THE FINAL PHILOSOPHY, OR THEORY OF PERFECTIBLE SCIENCE AS CONCURRING WITH REVELATION, ... 346–375

CHAPTER V.

PHILOSOPHIA ULTIMA: PROJECT OF THE PERFECTED SCIENCES AND ARTS, ... 376–402

INDEXES.

ANALYTICAL INDEX OF SUBJECTS, ... 403–412

ALPHABETICAL INDEX OF AUTHORS, ... 413–419

INTRODUCTION.

THE

ACADEMIC STUDY OF CHRISTIAN SCIENCE.

INTRODUCTION.

In the treatment of a vast theme, it will be necessary to sacrifice details for the sake of principles. If we would rise to general views, we must forego many a special inquiry which might please the fancy of the moment, and be content oftentimes with truths which can have no other charm than their own simple sublimity; as the traveller, in order to gain a panoramic view of the whole country, will leave behind him its pleasant lowlands and picturesque villages, and climb to some lonely and rugged summit, from whence can be descried nought but the grand outlines of earth and sea and sky in the naked majesty of nature.

And, as a preliminary duty, we shall need to sketch the region before us. Indeed, it would seem but right and becoming that the first public utterances from this new chair should explain and commend it. Hitherto, it can scarcely be said to have acquired a fitting name or province in the academic domain. Both teacher and student are somewhat like voyagers to new lands, who must make their map as they sail. Let it, therefore, be the object of the first lecture to define the limits of our study, to glance at its main features and to seize a foretaste of its advantages and pleasures.

What is proposed in this whole department is simply to blend more harmoniously together those two general bodies of learning, the scientific and the religious, which were once so compactly joined in Christian philosophy and scholastic culture, but have since been slowly falling apart, in jarring fragments, as one science after another has conflicted with

one doctrine after another, until at length the breach between them is too alarming to be any longer disregarded. The time has come, it is thought, to attempt their correlation and reconciliation more formally and thoroughly, by assigning to a single professor the whole of that intermediate ground formed by their intersection and common to them both: and hence the title which the college authorities have given to the chair is the "Harmony of Science and Revealed Religion."

Now, from this very title it will be seen, that the region before us, strictly speaking, is no unknown realm in the world of learning, but is rather a strip of border land—unfortunately also a scene of border warfare—between two adjacent provinces of ancient name and renown. We shall best be able to define its limits by first carefully excluding on either side what does not fairly belong to it, and then viewing what remains as its proper field and material.

On the one hand, then, let it be premised, that this is not a department of purely scientific instruction. It will not be the province of the chair to teach any of the sciences considered as bodies of positive knowledge, or to espouse any of the theories by which men of science are divided into parties, or, still less, to broach any new theories upon scientific questions. Such researches, in fact, would not be possible, and might not be desirable. They would not be possible, because no single mind could master all the sciences so as to be at home in each of them; and they might not be desirable, since those very faculties and habits of mind which are needed in special investigations, would hinder rather than help that more abstract and philosophical work which we have before us. Moreover, full provision for them has already been made in the academic system; and instead of intruding upon other established departments of learning, it should rather be our duty and privilege simply to accept the scientific facts and theories therein presented, and then proceed to study them in their relations to religious truth and knowledge. In a word, we must leave out of view so much of Science as cannot be brought into connection with Revealed Religion.

On the other hand, however, let it be premised also, that this is not a department of merely religious instruction. It will

not be the province of the chair to teach religion professionally as a system of divinity; or to defend polemically any of the creeds by which the religious world has been sundered into various denominations; or, much less, to add any new creed to the existing medley. However wisely such questions might divide us elsewhere, yet here, as a body of students engaged in an academic pursuit, we meet together on the high ground of our common Christianity, and are concerned for its defence against common foes, in the interest of truth as well as of virtue. To mingle the jargon of sects with that of the schools would but make worse confusion, tending to the reproach of sacred learning not less than to the disadvantage of the secular. And we need not fear that true religion, whether doctrinal or practical, is in any danger of being slighted, at its own time and place, in our schemes of education. Instead of forcing such studies into the more scholastic part of a curriculum, we may safely assume the leading religious truths and doctrines to be known and familiar, and limit ourselves to the simple task of showing their points of contact and correspondence with scientific facts and theories. In a word, we must leave out of view so much of Revealed Religion as cannot be brought into connection with Science.

When we have thus excluded what is purely scientific teaching on the one side and merely religious teaching on the other, there remains to be formed a midway course, which will include only what they have in common; being partly scientific and partly religious; and therefore, properly speaking, a philosophical department of instruction. Within such limits, it would seem to be the province of the chair to teach both religion and science so far as they are logically connected; to inculcate their mutual relations as joint interests of truth; to define their boundaries and laws as neighboring domains of research; and to exhibit their contents and results as one harmonious body of knowledge. They are thus brought together in the very title of the professorship; and to treat them otherwise, to pursue them as conflicting branches of learning or array them as antagonists on the field of inquiry, would be both unphilosophical and perilous. It would be

unphilosophical, because it would mar and sunder vast portions of truth which logically require each other and which, as lovers of truth, we should seek to combine together in their integrity and consistency; and it would be perilous, since it could only tend in its moral effects either toward superstition or toward bigotry, according as we became mere partisans of one interest against the other. It has, in fact, ever been the boast of our colleges that in them religion and science have been practically taught in harmony, and it is simply in order to promote such harmony that a new teacher has been charged with it as his special vocation. In so far as he fulfills that vocation, he will only be helping forward a work which dates from the origin of Christian learning, but which, owing to the growth of knowledge and the rise of new opinions, has become too vast for any one already immersed in more special researches and too important to be left to the risks of a casual treatment. The increasing multiplicity of intellectual pursuits seems to call for this new division of labor in the community of scholars, and there need be no fear that other fields will suffer curtailment or invasion. Leaving the existing scientific and religious courses undisturbed, the proposed course will simply aim to connect and complete them; to take the materials of truth which they respectively furnish in a fragmentary or unrelated state and organize them into a rational system; to show that all ascertained facts of nature and revealed truths of Scripture are not only congruous, but complemental; that even such scientific hypotheses and religious dogmas as seem to be in conflict are passing under fixed logical laws, through a process of mutual correction and conciliation, into a similar region of coherent verities; that it is thus the mission of science to confirm and illustrate religious truths and of religion to give rational support and consistency to scientific facts; and that, sooner or later in the history of mankind, there must result a perfect coincidence of human with divine knowledge, together with a practical blending of all the great interests issuing therefrom. In a word, that Religion and Science cannot do without each other; that God hath joined them together and man dare not put them asunder—this must be taken as the key-note to their Harmony.

Glancing next at the materials or topics inclosed in the province thus defined, we shall be at once embarrassed by their richness and variety. The most meagre synopsis of them (and as yet none other can be given), may serve to show the ample scope of our inquiries. There will be two general courses of study, corresponding to the two sides of the department, and these two courses, as made consecutive or parallel, will be joined in a third, designed for their completion and unity.

On the religious side, we shall at first be occupied with the study of Natural Theology as already in harmony with the Physical Sciences, from astronomy to anthropology:—the existence of a rational First Cause of the universe as evinced by traces of design and contrivance in each natural object and throughout all nature; the personality of that First Cause as at once conceivable, cognizable, and scientifically probable; and the attributes of that Divine Person, his creative power, wisdom, and goodness as displayed throughout the whole inanimate and animate creation. To this will succeed the study of Natural Religion as connected with the Mental Sciences, from psychology to metaphysics:—the probability of a future life as suggested by both material and spiritual analogies; of a divine government as based upon moral and social facts interpreted according to any ethical theory; of a present state of trial and discipline as required for the future fulfillment of our mental and moral capacities and for the completion of the divine government; together with the perfect reconcilableness of the whole theology and theodicy with any true metaphysical and ethical theory of the world. Having thus traced the scientific evidences of natural religion by the aid of Paley and Butler, we shall then proceed to the problems of Revealed Religion with a view to its connection and harmony with Science:—the probability of a supernatural revelation as sustained by the analogies of natural knowledge; the paradoxes of revelation as equalled by those of science; the historical development of revealed religion; the history of its evidences, from the primitive miracles and prophecies, through the successive conflicts of Christianity with Judaism, with Paganism, with Philosophy, with Barbarism, with Mohammedanism,

with Rationalism and Heathenism; the classification of its evidences; their logical and ethical value as estimated by rival evidential schools; their prospective increase and the new modern evidence already accruing from the more perfect sciences and likely to accrue through the whole scale of the sciences, with ever-cumulative probability toward moral certainty itself. The tendency of this part of the course will be to show the importance of science to religion.

On the scientific side, meanwhile, we shall be pursuing the study of Inductive Science, both physical and psychical, with a view to its connection with Revealed Religion:—the definition of science in distinction from common knowledge and from mere speculation; the different classifications of the sciences, with the only philosophical classification as based upon the order of facts in space and time; the logical methods of the different sciences, both physical and mental, and their normal scale from astronomy to anthropology, and from psychology to theology. To this may be added the study of their history, the true progress made in each of them by their chief votaries through the discovery of facts and verification of theories, together with still contending hypotheses, authorities and arguments; their relative stages of advancement and the prospects of their gradual completion. After thus following the great masters of inductive logic, from Bacon to Whewell, we shall then advance to the more abstruse problems of Metaphysical Science in its harmony with Revealed Religion:—the proved existence of a Creator or Absolute Mind as the only rational postulate and support of science; the validity of reason and revelation as respective functions of the divine intellect and human intellect and correlate factors of knowledge in all the sciences; the logical rules or canons applicable to their normal relations in the sciences, to their existing relations, to their prospective relations; and the ideal perfectibility of knowledge through a gradual concurrence of reason with revelation and final coincidence of science with religion. The tendency of this part of the course will be to show the importance of religion to science.

At length on the basis of these elementary, though abstract

reasonings, will follow their most practical and popular application in the ensuing course of lectures, treating of the historical origin, development and prospects of Christian science; of the early conflicts and alliances between science and religion from the dawn of Greek philosophy to the Reformation; of modern antagonism between science and religion as maintained by infidels and apologists in the different sciences, in philosophy and in civilization; of modern indifferentism; modern eclecticism; modern scepticism, each treated in the same manner; and of the essential harmony of science and religion as involving the promotion of the one, the vindication of the other, and the consequent establishment of the Final Philosophy or theory and art of perfect knowledge.

Such is the task before us. The bare statement of it would be enough to intimidate and appal us, were the perfect fulfillment of it to be exacted from any single mind. Indeed, nothing but its transcendent importance and urgency could warrant our undertaking it; and it therefore behooves us, first of all, to assure ourselves that it is both practicable and desirable.

But here, at the threshold, we are met by an objection which should be challenged and repelled from the outset, though it can only be thoroughly treated at a subsequent stage of our investigation. It may be said, as indeed it has sometimes been said, that religion and science have nothing to do with each other; that the one is matter of mere faith, the other of pure knowledge; the one a product of divine revelation, the other of human reason; the one concerned only with eternal affairs, the other with temporal; in a word, that the two interests are absolutely distinct and incongruous, so that any attempt to join or blend them would be but the fond conceit of a devout or a speculative fancy. There have been sober men of science, like Faraday, who could see no advantage in tieing up the study of the physical sciences with natural religion, and judicious divines, like Chalmers, who would deprecate a mere academic theism or speculative theology as tending to intellectual pride and unbelief; and the authority of Bacon himself has been cited against such a union as "a mixture which makes both an heretical religion and a fantastical philosophy."

Now, that there may be modes of viewing and exhibiting science and religion in conjunction, which are open to this objection, need not be questioned. Were true science combined with a false religion, or the true religion combined with false science, the only result would be their mutual degradation and degeneracy; as when the sons of God became mated with the daughters of men and were cursed with a progeny of giants in sin. But the real question is, whether true science and true religion are wholly insusceptible of being correlated; whether, though distinct and diverse, they are not still reciprocal and complemental; whether, in a word, when brought together and logically adjusted, they will not prove to be but opposite halves of the same rounded whole of truth, supporting segments in the same rising arch of knowledge, harmonious interests, wedded

"Like perfect music unto noble words."

At the first glance, by their most common definition, their relationship will assert itself. Science is exact knowledge and religion is revealed doctrine; but revealed doctrine and exact knowledge of what? Of facts; and largely, of the very same facts. For, of every class of facts, there is both a religious aspect and a scientific aspect, a phase of them which has been revealed by God and a phase of them which has been discovered by man. The mere scientist may seek to view them in an exclusively scientific light, as phenomena of nature, or the mere religionist may try to view them in an exclusively religious light, as manifestations of God; but after all, they are but the same objects contemplated on different sides; the same realities, bearing phases both of which are equally essential to their reality. We might almost as well attempt to ignore the facts themselves in which science and religion are but rooted branches of truth, as to ignore their relations to each other.

Let us take an illustration from astronomy. In the starry heavens the scientific observer discovers illimitable matter and force disposed throughout space and time under fixed mechanical laws; in other words, a department of physics; while the religious observer beholds the immensity, eternity,

omnipotence, and wisdom of the one true God; in a word, a department of theology. Now, these different aspects of the same phenomena, these almost opposite views of the same facts, are not only equally true, but equally essential to make up the whole truth in regard to those facts. The one has been most surely discovered by man, and the other as certainly revealed by God, and neither can be surrendered but at the sacrifice or peril of both. Celestial physics without the postulate of a Great First Cause or Creator, would be little better than the elephant in the cosmogony of the Brahmin, which upheld the world and yet itself stood upon nothing; and the Jehovah of the Bible without the astronomical illustration of His attributes, would now seem but like an Israelitish Jupiter enthroned in the clouds of Palestine. The absurdity of the one in a scientific light would only be equalled by the superstition of the other in a religious light. But let these two half truths or halves of truth be brought together; let the laws which bind sun, planet, and satellite in their spheres be viewed as expressions of the divine will, and the whole theatre of immensity be lighted up with the divine intelligence, and then both the sage and the saint can together exclaim, "The heavens declare the glory of God."

Our first argument then is, that religion and science are related logically. By their very definition it becomes inconceivable, if not impossible, that they should form two distinct kinds of truth, flying apart in everlasting contradiction. The scientific view of the universe, and the religious view of the universe, stand or fall together. Take either from the other, and you would have but half the truth, and that half without logical support. Imagine, if you can, science perfected without religion, all phenomena referred to their laws and all laws to their causes, and you would still need the rational postulate of a great First Cause of those causes, and a great Final Cause of those laws, such as you can only find in the Jehovah of Scripture, the Alpha and the Omega, the beginning and the end, which was and which is and which is to come, God over all blessed forever. Or, on the other hand, try to imagine religion completed without science, the one true God revealed in all the plenitude of His perfections, and you would

still need as a rational counterpart of this revelation, such an illustration of His perfections as the different sciences alone can afford; celestial physics to unfold His immensity, eternity and omnipotence; terrestrial physics, to display His wisdom and goodness; and the psychical sciences, to approve His holiness, justice and truth. If your science without religion would land you in the absurdity of a creation without a Creator, your religion without science would leave you with the abstraction of a Creator without a creation. But imagine now that Creator inhabiting yet controlling His creation; think of all natural laws as resolved into divine methods, and of divine attributes as expressed in all natural phenomena; and you will see how perfectly logical, how absolutely reasonable is the correlation and coalescence of science and religion.

But, in the second place, they are related historically as well as logically. Their connection is not merely nominal and ideal, but real and actual. It is simple matter of fact, that they have grown up together through all the past. The history of the one cannot be written without that of the other. They appear in every age as twin-factors of human progress. In all nations, as in all individuals, they have proceeded side by side, and their successive conflicts and alliances have formed the crises and turning-points in the development of civilization. Their very representatives have been the central figures in every great scene of history. In Egypt, out of which Moses comes with the wisdom of the Pharaohs as the true conqueror of the Sphinx, behold religion nursed in the cradle of science: in Judea, whither eastern sages are led by a star to the incarnate Christ, behold science bowed at the shrine of religion: in Greece, where Paul from the Areopagus declares to the Epicureans and Stoics their unknown god, behold religion solving the problems of science: in Pagan Rome, when Plato speaks through the apologies of Justin, behold science defending religion: in Christian Rome, when Aquinas reasons with the logic of Aristotle, behold religion reclaiming science: in Italy, when Galileo braves the anathemas of the Church, behold science dissipating the superstitions of religion: in Germany, when Luther gives

back the Bible to the world, behold religion rekindling the torch of science: in America, whence a young Christian civilization is already scattering light and life, behold science giving wings to religion: and through coming ages, as knowledge runs to and fro and holiness fills the earth, behold both religion and science together shedding their millennial splendor. What, indeed, from the highest point of view, is the history of the world but the history of science and religion?

And, in the third place, they are also related practically. Their logical and historical connection bears its fruit before our eyes. In common life they appear as united interests, so vitally bound up together that neither could live without the other, and both would perish were they torn asunder. If you view them in your own experience, you will find that it is simply impracticable that your faith should contradict your knowledge, that you could hold as true in religion what you believed to be false in science, or as true in science what you knew to be false in religion. And if you view them in the world at large, you will find them so intertwined that they must flourish or decay together. Strike a blow at either and you wound both. Think of what society would be, were religion cultivated to the absolute neglect of science,—a reign of superstition, tyranny, and barbarism, like that which covered Europe during the dark ages of the Church. Think of what society would be, were science cultivated to the utter neglect of religion,—a reign of infidelity, impiety and sensuality, brilliant but abortive, like that which in French history has been written in letters of blood and terror. Then think of what the world would be, were these two great interests pursued together, correcting and perfecting each other, until civilization shall have triumphed over barbarism, and Christianity over heathenism throughout the earth,—and you will see that history joins with reason, and experience with theory in asserting the living reality of their relations.

And their relations are very extensive. They do not merely touch at occasional points, but form one continuous junction. There is no truth in Scripture which does not impinge upon some fact in nature, as there is no fact in nature which does not bear upon some truth in Scripture. Scientific

theories and religious doctrines act and re-act upon each other throughout the domain of research. We have but to glance along the boundary line of the two departments in order to see their correspondences. Each science is connected with some biblical doctrine; astronomy, with the doctrine of creation and the angels; geology, with the doctrine of genesis and the sabbath; anthropology, with the doctrine of the first and second Adam; psychology, with the doctrine of regeneration and immortality; sociology, with the doctrine of the Church and the millennium; theology, with all the peculiar doctrines of Christianity. In a word, the cyclopædia of science runs parallel with that of religion.

Moreover, their relations are very complicated. Instead of forming a bare contact, they overlap and combine, like intersecting spheres or intertwining branches. Though the facts of nature and truths of Scripture are ever accordant, yet the scientific hypotheses explaining those facts, and the religious dogmas expressing those truths, have become entangled together in endless knots of controversy. Every such dogma is involved in some such hypothesis. The dogma of immediate creation is involved in the rival hypotheses of evolution and succession; the dogma of the six days' genesis, in the rival hypotheses of uniformity and catastrophe; the dogma of the Adamic covenant, in the rival hypotheses of unity and plurality of races; the dogma of the resurrection, in the rival speculations of the spiritualist and materialist; the dogma of divine right, in the rival schemes of the socialist and legitimist; and all the peculiar dogmas of orthodoxy, in the rival systems of the naturalist and supernaturalist. In fact, everything dogmatic in religion is tied up with something hypothetic in science.

It need scarcely be added, that their relations are also very vital. Not in any merely harmless or abstract manner do they thus take hold of each other's very heart and life. Despite our general belief that all religious truths and scientific facts will be found accordant, yet at present there is no doctrine which is not staked in some theory and no theory which is not staked in some doctrine. If we hold the one we must let go the other, while if we give up either we may lose

both. What becomes of our theory of the heavens, if we hold that the worlds were commanded full-born from nothing? and yet, if we hold that they have been slowly evolved from nebulæ, where is our doctrine of creation? What becomes of our theory of the earth, if we hold that it was made in six days of twenty-four hours? and yet, if we hold that it has been developed through unmeasured time, where is our doctrine of the sabbath? What becomes of our theory of races, if we hold that they descended from Adam and Eve? and yet, if we hold that they sprang from indigenous centres, where is our doctrine of the divine image and fall of man? What becomes of our theory of the soul, if we hold that it is independent of the body? and yet if we hold that it is interwoven with the body, where is our doctrine of immortality and the resurrection? What becomes of our theory of society, if we hold that the millennium will be sudden and miraculous? and yet, if we hold that it will be historical and rational, where is our doctrine of the second coming and judgment of Christ? What becomes of our whole theory of religion, if we hold to a special and supernatural revelation? and yet if we hold to one that is natural and universal, where are all the distinctive doctrines of Christianity? Whatsoever we may hold in religion is thus so adventured with whatsoever we may hold in science as to put in peril the very life of truth and virtue.

If, then, these relations are so extensive, so complicated, so vital, they do surely require adjustment and admit of harmony. It will appear at a glance, that they are not what they should be, or what they might be, or what they will be.

They are not what they should be. Their existing state is not their normal state. Were religion and science perfected, they would together form one harmonious body of truth. Unless we adopt the monstrous conceit, that the one is exclusively true and the other utterly false, the one wholly of God and the other merely of the devil; or the equally wild fancy, that both are fictitious, the one mere superstition and the other all delusion,—we must grant their present conflict to be abnormal. No one who holds to the truth in each of them can believe their ideal state to be one of sheer contradiction. Whatever paradoxes may now obscure them, he knows that

in themselves they are congruous, and has but to survey the chaos of creeds and theories resulting from their existing antagonism, in order to assure himself that as yet their relations are not what they should be.

As little are they what they might be. Their existing state is not their necessary state. No fatality has doomed them to an abnormal strife. No insuperable obstacle forbids their adjustment. Not only have we a moral pre-assurance of it, but we have also capacities and means for facilitating it. We have simply to bring the two interests logically together as fast as they mature, and under the natural laws of thought, by the spontaneous affinities of truth, they will shake off all accretive errors and run together like drops of quicksilver from the dust. If our theories clash with our creeds, this is not because of any actual disagreement between natural facts and revealed truths, not even because of any essential defects in our instruments of knowledge, but simply because of some wrong induction from nature or some false interpretation of Scripture, because of some illegitimate use either of reason or of revelation. The very collisions which arise between science and religion in spite of their ideal harmony, are evidence that as yet their relations are not what they might be.

And still less are they what they will be. Their existing state is not their final state. The harmony possible between them is becoming actual. History shows that their present derangement is transient and partial. Already, whatsoever has been certainly discovered in nature is sufficiently congruous with whatsoever has been plainly revealed in Scripture. It is only the theoretical and the doctrinal, the hypothetical and the dogmatic portions of knowledge which remain in conflict, and even these have been steadily diminishing. While the least-developed sciences are in different stages of opposition to revealed religion, the more advanced and perfect are coming into harmony with it and yielding it new defence and illustration; and while the least-important doctrines are in seeming conflict with science, the more essential and fundamental may already be taken as its only rational postulates. And this mutual demonstration, this logical interaction, must go on from one class of facts and truths to another, until the reason

of man shall stand forth coincident with the word of God. As sure as the future will be born out of the past, as sure as truth must in the end be found consistent with truth, so sure it is that science and religion are destined to harmony.

But here it may be asked, whether we are not proving too much for our purpose. If the two interests are so surely destined to harmony, why meddle with them? Why attempt to adjust them? Let them alone, and they will adjust themselves. Providence, without artificial aid, will in the due time and way bring about the reconciliation. In one sense, this may be true. The great social and historic process of harmonizing science and religion may indeed be viewed as a Providential achievement, a work of that Divine Intellect whose revealed promises and rational premises combine to ensure its fulfillment, even in spite of all human error. And if any one is fain to adjourn the whole question to such a distant millenium, we would not disturb his confidence. He is welcome, if he can, to live in that grand future. But let him still have charity for those who must live in the present, and whose faith in the future does not blind them either to the labors of the past or to the duties of the present. Remember, it is not always the mere espousal of truth which will secure its triumph; nor need the certainty of that triumph relax all effort. Does the warrior sheathe his sword in mid-battle, because the foe is yielding? And shall that great moral victory which we discern as yet only afar off have any other effect than to kindle our zeal and courage? Besides, we have our places in the ranks and our parts in the battle. The victory will not come without our agency. Providence is pleased to effect it by means of human intellects, through successive generations, rather than to send it upon the world as a mere happy accident or blessed miracle. And instead of projecting it as a distant ideal beyond our present concern, it behooves us to struggle towards it as if it were within our reach, to be impatient of existing evils which hinder its realization, to feel our responsibility for its attainment and ever exalt it in our esteem over all inferior aims and attractions.

We are now ready to estimate the importance of the great reconciliation. And first, is it not important to Religion that

she should be in harmony with science? It is true, she does not depend upon science for the regeneration of the individual. Among her most sincere followers are those who know little even of theological science, and still less of science in general; while some of her most learned scholars, after preaching to others, might become castaways. It is true, too, that she may not be essentially dependent upon science even for the regeneration of society. We can conceive, that divine revelation might have been made at the first demonstrative, instantaneous, universal, like the noon-day sun, instead of having been like the twilight dawn, restricted to small portions of mankind, prolonged through thousands of years, and composed of only credible material; and we may even dream of new miracles and further revelations as means of vanquishing infidelity and promoting Christianity. But hitherto it has not pleased Divine Providence so to govern the world; and taking the facts as we now find them, what we affirm is, that for the vindication and extension of religion, science should be welcomed as a useful auxiliary, if not an indispensable ally. It would seem to be her mission to testify, though often as an unconscious witness, to the authority of the Scriptures; to aid in correcting and perfecting our fallible interpretation of their meaning; to afford the propagating appliances of art and literature and commerce; in a word, to clothe Christianity in that panoply of civilization, by means of which superstition and heathenism are to be subdued throughout the earth. She is as light to the cross and wings to the Church, from age to age. And it were simply idle to ignore an agent capable of becoming either so valuable a friend or so formidable a foe. Let the mere religionist who is fain to shut himself up in pharisaic scorn of her claims, beware lest the oracles of God be wrested from his hands, and become as a gospel to the Gentiles.

Is it not important to Science also, that she should be in harmony with religion? Too much has she hitherto slighted or forgotten her indebtedness to religion. Some of her most zealous votaries have worshipped Nature more than God, while not a few have defied the very altar at which her torch was lighted. It need not be denied that she has some-

times suffered from theological hate and fanatical interference; and it must be owned also, that there is an advantage in freeing her from the trammels of sanctimonious phraseology. Let her have all needed liberty of research, and frame her dialect as distinct as possible from that of worship. But when we have duly made such allowances, it will still remain true that, for the cultivation and completion of science, the sentiments and ideas, the truths and doctrines of religion are not only valuable, but essential. Humility, reverence, docility, faith are no less requisite in the pursuit of knowledge than the other more intellectual qualifications; for the kingdom of nature, like that of heaven, can only be entered as a little child. And in the last analysis, that Great First and Final Cause revealed in the Scriptures, affords the only rational theory of the world upon which even our physical researches can proceed, or be wrought into intelligible unity. Religion alone, by exhibiting the universe as the creation of a Creator, can transform it from chaos to cosmos; and without her sublime revelation it would be not less anomalous to reason than appalling to faith. She is herself the very lamp of reason and the only clue to the riddle of the world. Let the mere scientist who is fain to cast off her teachings in the pride of research, be assured that he will but find nature to be her temple, and himself, like the Athenian of old, an ignorant worshipper at her shrine.

And lastly, is it not important to Philosophy, as the friend of both science and religion, that she should recognise and pursue their harmony? Her aim may indeed seem more speculative than that of science, and less practical than that of religion, as everywhere she searches for truth as truth for its own sake. And her course in pursuit of that aim may at times have been wayward, as here she has ignored all religion for the sake of science, or there she has merged all science in religion. Not yet has she reached her own lofty ideal by embracing them both in one view. Not yet has she wrought that complete system of knowledge which shall combine all modes of inquiry in all fields of research. But if religion and science are genuine provinces of truth, if reason and revelation

are correlate factors of knowledge, it is only by conjoining both factors throughout both provinces, that the complete system of knowledge can ever be attained; it is only in and through the harmony of science and religion that we may aspire after the one Ultimate Philosophy.

Descending now from these general views, for a glance at the educational value of Christian science, we shall find that it ranks with the highest studies which can mould the forming mind. It takes its place among them as a course of applied logic; of logic, in its richest inductive processes, and of such logic as applied to the pre-eminent problems of science, religion and philosophy. Apart from its momentous significance in a moral light, it cannot but have an intellectual advantage, distinguishing it from the theological study, known as Christian Apologetics, which enters more particularly into the training of the clergy than into the liberal culture of those who are not yet committed as propagandists of a creed. We do not undervalue such attempts to render science tributary to orthodoxy, but we believe it possible also to make essential Christianity helpful to science, and that this, as well as the other, should be included in the education of an accomplished scholar. Moreover, in a Philosophical Faculty as distinguished from a Theological Faculty, while it is ever of absolute importance to forestall the objections of sceptics, yet the more characteristic aim will be to develop the intellectual capacities, to discipline the reasoning powers, to induce philosophical habits of thought, and to subserve the interests of truth and learning. It is, in fact, for such secondary purposes largely that the great works of Paley and Butler, with their acknowledged defects, have been used so long in the English and American universities. Though primarily designed to repel the arguments of the atheist and infidel, yet for generations they have also served as a kind of mental gymnastic for the training of the Christian scholar in the philosophy of religion. In this character they may almost be said to have a valuation with the higher logic or mathematics; and if we may judge by the number of editions, introductions, compends, analyses, which have accumulated for the help of teachers and students, they are not likely to be very soon

supplanted. Long before we are ready to store them away among the mere trophies in the arsenal of the Christian Evidences, they may yet do much good service in drilling vigorous thinkers, and acute reasoners, as well as able defenders of the faith.

But besides this mere intellectual discipline, this incidental advantage to the student, there will be the still higher moral benefit of having such symmetrical development of all his powers as will leave neither his knowledge nor his faith in excess or at variance, and of being furnished with such sound, yet catholic principles, as will fit him for the high duties appertaining to the whole educated class in our day. The questions with which we are to deal are the living questions of the age. Instead of being restricted, as in former times, to the cloisters of divinity, the academies of science, and the shades of philosophy, they have become the topics of the newspaper, the rail-car and the fire-side. And they are rising in importance every hour. You are going forth to meet them in a practical form. As lawyers, physicians, clergymen, scholars in every walk of life, you will soon be mingling in the controversies of your generation. You will soon be exposed to the intellectual temptations peculiar to your respective callings, and to all the evils of one-sided culture and special aims. You will be taking sides in the great battle between the knowledge and faith of the time; and it rests with you now to determine, in these preliminary trials, whether you shall hereafter be found among the mere bigots and charlatans of your day, or ranked as lovers of truth and benefactors of mankind.

As to the pleasures of our academic task, the argument may not be so plain. Unfortunately, we have to deal with many subjects which do not excite a spontaneous interest in all minds. Scientific studies are too dry to some and religious studies too grave to others, to be esteemed aught but mere task-work; and when both are to be pursued together in the still more arid walks of philosophy, we are led quite away from common life into a region of sublimated thought and feeling toward which but few minds are attracted and which can only be reached by long-sustained efforts of attention and

thought. And yet, as the adventurous traveller in search of rare prospects in nature, while ascending some difficult mountain range, scaling peak after peak, with strained nerve and muscle, will be rewarded at every pause with a healthier glow and a grander horizon, so in the course of these arduous speculations of ours we may enjoy an elevation and expansion of mind, fancy, and heart, well worth all the labor they cost us.

There will be that intellectual pleasure which springs from the discovery of new truths, and the perception of new and beautiful relations between them; subtle harmonies, which easily persuade us

> "How charming is divine philosophy;
> Not harsh and crabbed, as dull fools suppose,
> But musical as is Apollo's lute."

That the word and the works of God will yet be found harmonious; that Nature and Scripture must appear as only pages in the same book and parts of one argument; that divine revelation is one day to be supported by a human demonstration; in a word, that science shall ever expand toward Omniscience, is at once a yearning and a presentiment of the philosophic mind; and as we trace step by step the realization of this glorious ideal, we may know something of that keen mental enjoyment and rational exultation with which the zealous seeker for truth cries Eureka at the goal of his researches.

There will also be that imaginative pleasure which attends an enlargement of the field of thought and a multiplication of the materials for conjecture and speculation. The connections between science and religion are as numerous, extensive and intricate as are the connections between the Creator and His creation; and as we shall proceed to unfold them one after another in their due order, Nature will open before us in all her infinite variety and vicissitude as but a manifold revelation of Him who "hath made everything beautiful in its time." Devout fancy, now soaring up amid the countless orbs of astronomy, then diving down amid the secret atoms of chemistry, anon wandering back through the teeming ages of Genesis, at length hastening on to the ripening glories of the Apocalypse, will find herself in realms of fact more won-

derful than any realm of fiction; the sober verities of religion will outshine the most splendid fables of superstition; and it shall be as if the classic Muses were following in the train of the Christian Graces on a tour of the creation for the good of the creature and the glory of the Creator.

And there will be added to all this the high moral satisfaction with which we witness the triumph of truth over error, right over wrong, and good over evil. That conflict which is raging in the bosom of this age between the reason of man and the word of God, and which is yet to issue practically in the predominance of a Christian civilization over heathen barbarism throughout the earth, is here to be viewed by us in the calm region of abstraction, in the cool mood of philosophy, and in the clear light of prophecy. As from the loop-holes of a retreat, wherein we are being drilled for the actual warfare, we look forth on a battle-field, bounded only by the horizon of thought, covered all over with the smoke of controversy, and whereon not kings and peoples alone, but great ideas and principles are struggling for the mastery, with lasting interests of humanity staked upon the issue; and as we see how the powers of light are steadily gaining on the powers of darkness, and even now marshalling to victory, we may share in that solemn joy which the great master of English philosophy utters forth in the name of the seers and sages of all time: "It is a pleasure to stand on the shore and to see ships tossed upon the sea; a pleasure to stand in the window of a castle and to see a battle and the adventures thereof below; but no pleasure is comparable to the standing on the vantage-ground of truth (a hill not to be commanded, and where the air is always clear and serene,) and to see the errors and wanderings and mists and tempests in the vale below; so always that this prospect be with pity, and not with swelling or pride."

PART FIRST.

THE PHILOSOPHICAL PARTIES

AS TO

THE RELATIONS

BETWEEN

SCIENCE AND RELIGION.

57225

CHAPTER I.

EARLY CONFLICTS AND ALLIANCES BETWEEN SCIENCE AND RELIGION.

At the close of our introduction we stood upon an imaginary eminence of faith and hope, overlooking the vast battle-field of modern philosophy. Resuming the figure, we purpose now to review the motley hosts which are there mustered; to point out the various standards under which they are marshalled; to trace their changing fortunes over the field, as here they are seen closing in the deadly grapple, or there resting idly upon their arms, or now rushing wildly in the charge, or anon trailing their banners in the dust; to show how the lines are forming for a last decisive struggle; and at length to gather against the chances of defeat, the sure presages of victory. In other words, the next few chapters will be devoted to a survey of the present state of parties in the philosophical world as to the great question of reconciling Science and Religion, with a glance at the prospects of their ultimate harmony.

And we shall begin this part of the work with a brief historical sketch of the causes of their present disturbed relations, as traceable from the dawn of Greek philosophy to the Reformation. It is only by thus studying the past that we may hope to understand the present and to forecast the future. History shows us especially, that great intellectual movements do not burst upon the world as mere happy accidents or miracles, but grow rationally, almost intelligibly, out of some existing need of the human mind, which is known and felt by

the few long before it is seen by the many; for so does Providence rule mankind in order and reason. And if this be true of those two vast reformations in Religion and Science which we now associate with such names as Luther and Bacon and hail as the wonders of our own era, then we must go back to the times when they first sprang into view and even to the causes which for centuries before had been secretly and steadily working towards them. Only by this means, as we shall see, can we trace the rise of that great schism between human and divine knowledge and consequent anarchy of opinions and interests which has become the characteristic peril of modern civilization.

And it may be another reason for such a review, that therein pre-eminently will history appear as philosophy teaching by example. If we are sometimes amused by turning the mistakes of antiquity into a foil to modern wisdom, yet we can also learn from them that we are ourselves still fallible, and especially as to this very class of questions. Indeed, no more instructive chapter of human errors could be written than that which would treat of the collisions between the religious and scientific classes since the beginning of the Christian era; nor could we have a better moral preparation for the controversies still pending between them than a candid study of those which have already been settled. We shall see Christian fathers rejecting facts which heathen philosophers had long before discovered, and infidel savants scoffing at truths which pagan sages yearned to have revealed; and if we need to remember that such models of orthodoxy as Augustine and Turrettin were now and then betrayed into false science, yet we should not forget that such masters of science as Kepler and Newton never for one moment swerved from true religion.

It need hardly be said, that these mistakes of great and good men of the past will be recalled in no invidious spirit, either towards sound theology and religion, or towards true philosophy and science. From our higher point of view we may now distinguish the virtues of individuals from the faults of their times; the truths which have endured from the errors which have passed away. Moreover, even a defeated party can afford to smile at absurdities which it has outgrown, when it is

seen that history reverses the picture against its antagonist, as soon as it is viewed from the other side.

Without pretending to give a full history of Religion and Science in their connection with the leading interests of civilization, it will be enough for our purpose to cull a few examples of the successive conflicts and alliances of the religious and the scientific spirit, the theologic and the philosophic mind, as they will appear, according to a natural division of time, in the pre-Christian and post-Christian ages of Pagan science, and the Patristic, Scholastic, and Reforming ages of Christian science, down to the present critical epoch of decisive warfare. And in sketching these outlines we shall endeavor to combine the views of such historians of religion as Neander, Gieseler, Mosheim, Alzog, Milman and Schaff; such historians of philosophy as Brucker, Tennemann, Cousin, Ueberweg, Zeller, Erdmann; and such historians of literature and civilization as Tiraboschi, Sismondi, Hallam, Schlegel, Guizot, Balmes and Draper.

The Pre-Christian Age of Pagan Science.

(B. C. 500).

And if we would seek the first signs and beginnings of present conflicts we must go back to the age of Pagan philosophy before the Christian era. It is true that science was then in its infancy as nursed in the schools of Greece, and religion had not yet come forth from its divine pupilage in Judea; but certain innate or traditional elements of them both were already active in the existing civilization, and the inevitable strifes of coming ages were dimly foreshadowed as in miniature, wherever bigotry could array itself against enlightenment, or the subtlety of knowledge was seen corrupting the simplicity of faith.

On the one hand, the spirit of bigotry had begun to convert the votaries of philosophy into proto-martyrs of science. It was this spirit, which held up Socrates to public odium in the comedy of Aristophanes as trying to chase Jupiter out of the heavens, because he had sought to explain the thunder and lightning of tempests by a theory of aerial concussions, and at length, for his alleged contempt of the gods, condemned him

to the cup of hemlock. It was this spirit, which drove Anaxagoras into exile for teaching that the god of day was but a globe of fire, and an eclipse not a presage of the wrath of Apollo, but the shadow of a passing planet. It was this spirit, which accused Aristarchus of sacrilegiously attempting to remove the sacred hearth of the universe by supposing in order to account for the phenomena of the seasons, that the earth might be in motion and the heavens at rest. And it was this spirit which, at a later period, led Pliny to reflect upon Hipparchus, the father of Greek astronomy, as having invaded the abode of the gods in making a catalogue of the stars.

On the other hand, however, the spirit of sophistry had begun to pervert the recreants from the old mythology into prototypes of the later infidelity. It was this spirit which bred a race of scoffing sciolists amid the altars and temples of the popular faith, and at length, as expressed in the tragedies of Euripides and by the arts of Alcibiades, undermined whatsoever of moral and religious truth still lingered in the ancient legends and laws. It was this spirit which, as Plutarch tells us, even whilst offering at the altar, viewed the priest as but a slaughtering cook, and having decorously consulted the oracle retired to sneer at the bad poetry of its responses. It was this spirit which, in the age of Roman satire, ripened into such hypocrisy that Seneca could gravely argue that divine worship was due only to good manners, whilst Cicero declared that two augurs could not look each other in the face without laughing. And it was this spirit which, at length, under the philosophical emperors, degraded the priests of Jupiter into ministers of the senate, and collected the gods of the provinces into the pantheon as mere trophies of Cæsar.

By the time the Roman rule had spread over the known world, such prelusive strifes between a false religion and a false science had left nothing but a mass of outworn superstitions and fragmental truths, in the midst of which philosophy sat hopeless and unbelieving, with all her problems as yet unsolved.

The Post-Christian Age of Pagan Science.

(A. D. 1–200.)

When Christianity at length emerged upon the stage of Gentile civilization, religion and science were first brought face to face as leading powers in the history of the world, and for a century or two afterwards each seemed striving to supplant the other.

On the side of Christianity, there was at first an apparent effort to supplant Philosophy. The apostles had scarcely left the Church, when there sprang up, in the unlettered class from which the first Christians had been largely recruited, a weak jealousy of human learning which, it was claimed, had been superseded in them by miraculous gifts of wisdom and knowledge. Clement of Rome was held by this party to have enjoined abstinence from mental culture as one of the apostolic canons; Barnabas was classed with St. Paul as the author of an epistle which carries its own evidence of imposture; and Hermas made his allegorizing "Shepherd" as ignorant as Bunyan of all Greek and Roman learning.

When Christianity came in closer conflict with paganism, this spirit well nigh pervaded the apologetics of the time. Tatian and Hermias assailed the Greek philosophers with unsparing invective and satire. Christians were exhorted to flee from the Grove and the Lyceum into the porch of Solomon. "Away," cried Tertullian, "with a Stoic, and a Platonic, and a Dialectic Christianity." We know that the first apologist, Justin, who strove to lead the school of Plato to the feet of Christ, could not quite satisfy those whom he was defending, so long as he refused to doff the philosopher's mantle, though he afterwards added to it the martyr's crown. And Eusebius tells us how the culture of logic and geometry came to be placed among the crimes of heretics, of whom it was complained that they lost sight of heaven whilst employed in measuring the earth, and neglected the sacred writings for the works of such infidels as Euclid, Aristotle, and Galen.

On the side of Philosophy, however, there was at the same time a like effort to supplant Christianity. As we are told

by the apostles themselves, it crept into the very fold of the Church, corrupting the pure gospel with an eloquent sophistry; or from beyond its pale scornfully assailed it with the wisdom of the world. At first, indeed, the great writers of the age, Plutarch, Seneca, and Tacitus, deigned not even to notice the new religion which had appeared among the vulgar crowd of gods which for ages past a Protean superstition had been accumulating, or only alluded to it distantly as a fanatical folly which had broken out in a corner of the empire. And even after its rapid spread among the people could no longer be overlooked, it was for some time met with policy and satire rather than with argument. Pliny the younger, whilst admitting the blameless lives of the Christians, felt obliged to treat them as visionary disturbers of the peace; the witty Lucian passed by an easy sneer from the tricks of the magicians to the miracles of the apostles; and Celsus poured all the contempt of aristocratic culture upon the humbling doctrines and homely virtues of the crucified peasant of Nazareth.

But as the philosophy of the age became more aware of the exclusive claims of Christianity, there was a last grand rally of all the schools against the rude teachers from Galilee. The knowledge of the East and the wisdom of the West, Gnosticism and Platonism, were woven together in the Neo-Platonism of Ammonius Saccas, as the one eclectic creed of reason, and the austere Plotinus put forward as superior to any of the Christian models of virtue and devotion. Porphyry, having wrought the system through the polytheistic legends, adroitly strove to match the Hebrew prophecies with the Heathen oracles; and Hierocles aimed to finish the caricature by exhibiting Apollonius of Tyana, a wonder-working demi-god of the Greeks, as the equal of Jesus of Nazareth, the new miracle-working hero of the Jews. When, however, Justin, as a convert from their own ranks, was seen sitting in the Platonic cloak at the feet of Christ, their disdain was quickly changed to hatred and persecution. What had been already hinted in the writings of the philosophers was commanded from the throne of the emperors, and the Coliseum echoed with the fierce shouts of the populace as, year after year, Christian martyrs were thrown to the lions.

It was not until the union of Church and State under Constantine that these bitter conflicts passed away, and Philosophy and Christianity at length joined hands, on their first battle-ground, in the schools of Alexandria.

The Patristic Age of Christian Science.

(A. D. 200—700.)

In the age of the Greek fathers, there was a false peace between theology and philosophy; and religion and science, in consequence, became more or less corrupted by admixture with each other.

Theology, on its part, became corrupted through its rash alliance with the old philosophy. The doctrines of St. John were enveloped in the abstractions of Plato; the Son of God was identified as the divine Logos of the Schools; and the high mysteries of the trinity, the incarnation, and the atonement, were couched under abstruse distinctions of metaphysics. Justin Martyr, in his Apologies, had already wrested from Platonism as much of its ethics and theism as it had in common with Christianity. Clement of Alexandria in his Stromata, proceeded to unfold out of such seeds of natural reason the more perfect truths of revelation, and to weave behind the popular Christianity the elements of faith into a system of knowledge. Origen by his allegorical interpretation forced a hidden sense of Scripture which, as the kernel of the Word, should express the occult system of Clement. And thenceforward followed a line of Greek fathers in the East, such as Eusebius, Athanasius, Basil, the two Gregories, Chrysostom and the two Cyrils, who did scarcely more than consecrate the spirit of the Academy in the cloisters and councils of the Church. The chief exceptions were among the Latin fathers of the West, such as Irenæus, Tertullian, and Cyprian, who from the first had resisted the philosophical tendency, and Lactantius, Jerome, and Augustine, who led the way more or less consciously to the system of Aristotle, as that of Plato was on the wane.

Philosophy itself, meanwhile, became not less corrupted through its forced alliance with the new theology. If it gained somewhat on its metaphysical side by having its own

notional entities traced up to revealed realities as the flower from the germ of reason, yet it lost quite as much on its physical side, through a narrowing logic and exegesis which bound it within the letter of Scripture and turned it away from all empirical research; and consequently even such crude natural science as it had inherited from the early Greeks was soon forgotten or buried under a mass of patristic traditions. In geology the speculations of Thales, Anaximenes, and Heraclitus, tracing the growth of the world from water, air, or fire, were only exchanged for the fanciful allegories and homilies of Origen, Basil, and Ambrose on the Hexæmeron or six days' work of creation. In astronomy the heliocentric views of Aristarchus and Pythagoras had already given place to the Ptolemaic theory of the heavens. as a system of crystalline spheres revolving around the earth; and the theologian thus left free to think of man as the moral pivot of the universe, could easily reconcile the theory with Scripture. According to the Orthodox Catechism attributed to Justin Martyr, the chamber or canopy of the heavens, described in the Psalms, is formed by a huge globe or dome of glass which rests upon the waters flowing around the earth which in its turn, as Job declares, is hung upon nothing. St. Chrysostom, or perhaps Severian, a turgid orator mistaken for the "golden-mouthed preacher," explained that the setting sun did not go underneath and around the earth, according to the pagan notion, but passed obliquely below the horizon, and thus, as Solomon says, hasted back to the place whence he arose.

In geography the corruption of natural knowledge with false Biblical views became even more remarkable, and the doctrine of the earth's rotundity and antipodes which had been held by both Plato and Aristotle, and all but proved by the Alexandrian geometers, was at length discarded as a fable not less monstrous than heretical. St. Jerome, in commenting upon the living wheels in Ezekiel's vision, speaks of a foolish conceit of philosophers that there are two hemispheres whose inhabitants stand with feet opposite, like the cherubim in the temple. Lactantius, the Christian Cicero, departing in this matter from his model, classed the notion of a peopled globe among the vagaries of a false

science, and ridiculed such new wonders of the world as hanging gardens, climbing rivers, and inverted men walking beneath us, like shadows in the water. Even Augustine, though he cautiously granted the spherical figure of the earth, denied the existence of antipodes as contrary to the Scripture doctrine of the first Adam, the descent of races from one pair being physically impossible were such unknown regions beyond the seas inhabited by man. So inwrought with these fancies did the theological mind become, that one Cosmas Indicopleustes, an Alexandrian monk of the sixth century, at length set forth a standard Biblical geography, "Topographia Christiana," in which, after mapping the earth as an oblong plain, bounded by trough-like seas, covered with a crystal roof, and having a mountain range in the back ground, behind which the sun was hid at night, he proceeded to cite patriarchs, prophets, and apostles in its defence, as doctrine concerning which it was not lawful for a Christian to doubt.

At the same time, all the issuing interests of this Christianized paganism could not but share in its hybrid character. Its piety became but a mixture of austerity and license. Anthony, the father of asceticism, led forth from the luxury of the city and the court a crowd of anchorites to the caves and deserts of Egypt; Pachomius, the founder of the cloister life, organized monasteries and nunneries as sanctuaries of virtue amid a social corruption too gross to be described; and Simeon, the Stylite, stood for thirty years upon his lofty column above the surrounding worldliness as a model to after ages of penance and mortification. Its ritual was a mere medley of incongruous usages. The sign of the cross became a common charm, as well as a sacred rite; the Lord's day was observed by imperial edict, on a day devoted to the god of the sun; and Christian worship was celebrated in Greek and Roman basilicæ, whose interior was after the pattern of the Jewish synagogue. And its polity was little more than a compact of churchly pride and civil rule. Grand ecclesiastical councils were convoked as organs of the Holy Ghost by the decrees of emperors, with pomp and sometimes with tumult; Christian and Pagan factions contended for supremacy in the Roman Senate; and only ten years after the eagles

of Constantine had carried the cross throughout the empire, Julian, the Apostate, was impiously rebuilding the altars of Apollo and the temple of Solomon.

The Patristic type of Christian science has been likened to a twilight dream of thought before the long night watches of the middle ages. It passed away with the Byzantine empire, of which it was the setting glory, and there ensued, during a chaotic period of several centuries, as elements of another culture, the descent of the Germanic tribes with the new blood of the North, the rise of Charlemagne with the great schools of the West, and the inroads of the Saracens with the lost learning of the East.

The Scholastic Age of Christian Science.

(A. D. 900–1400.)

In the age of the schoolmen, the truce existing between theology and philosophy gave place to a bondage, and the one grew so strong and the other so weak, that there could be as little of fair strife as of free alliance between them.

Theology, in course of time, grew strong enough to subjugate philosophy. It made the Church the only school; orthodoxy, the one test of all truth; the traditions of the fathers, the sole pabulum of the intellect; and the system of Aristotle, a mere frame-work to the creed of Augustine. But it was not by one stride that it reached the throne.

There was first a long period of transition, from the seventh to the tenth century, while the free Platonic spirit still lingered, as in John Scotus Erigena, the Erin-born Scot, who in the midst of surrounding barbarism boldly dreamed of a universal philosophy, as Charlemagne had dreamed of a universal empire, to be wrought out of the wrecks of former systems.

There followed, during the eleventh and twelfth centuries, the forming period of scholasticism, when its first disciples were gathered by Lanfranc in the great Norman Abbey of Bec. Anselm of Canterbury, the second St. Augustine, announced its leading principle by placing faith before knowledge, and confining reason within the bounds of revelation. Peter Lombard, the Master of Sentences, narrowed still more

the circle of free thought by putting the authority of the Church above that of Scripture, and digesting the conflicting opinions of the fathers as the only problems of right reason; and Alexander of Hales, the Irrefragable Doctor, rendered the thraldom of the intellect complete by systematizing the patristic traditions or sentences with the Aristotelian logic, and condensing them into the first Summary of Theology or body of divinity.

Then came the crowning epoch of scholasticism, in the thirteenth century, when its grandest doctors flourished. Albert the Great, the Universal Doctor, wrought the whole Aristotelian system of philosophy into the theological cyclopædia, with a voluminous erudition which amazed his age. Thomas Aquinas, the Angelical Doctor, distilled the huge learned compound into brilliant syllogisms, with a transcendent genius which dazzled all Europe, and made him the very idol of the schools. Duns Scotus, the Subtle Doctor, proceeded to evaporate the distinctions of Aquinas, before thousands of students, with an enthusiasm passing modern comprehension; and a host of other great doctors with lofty titles, the Enlightened, the Profound, the Sublime, the Perspicuous, the Solemn, paced the same beaten walk of the Stagyrite round about Zion.

And, at the same time, into the service of this arid orthodoxy seems to have been pressed all else that was good and great in human nature. It claimed among its fruits the highest types of virtue and piety. Bernard of Clairvaux, the Mellifluous Doctor, threw over it the charm of a saintly eloquence blended with a knightly valor in its defence; Hugo and Richard, the mystics of St. Victor, retired with it from the strife of the schools into the reveries of the cloister; and Bonaventura, the Seraphic Doctor, mounted by means of it towards the very heaven of rapt devotion. It summoned all the arts to its embellishment. Raphael, as with the pencil of an archangel, portrayed its ideals of heavenly purity and grace; Michael Angelo embodied in architecture the magnificent monuments of its intellectual energy; and Dante wove into verse the gorgeous legends, which, like sunset clouds, illumine its very decline. And it was attended in its career

by every form of pomp and grandeur. Its harsh dialectics had the tournaments of chivalry for a gay foreground, and issued in the splendid romance of the crusades; its prodigious lore flowered into a ritual which, it was said, the inhabitants of heaven might envy, if envy could enter their minds; and its stern decrees were executed by a monarch who had made the throne of the Cæsars his footstool, and before whom kings with their peoples quailed as the vice-gerent of God.

Philosophy, however, during all these centuries, could only succumb to theology. At the beginning of scholasticism, in the person of her first votary, she had been forced to yield to the strong arm of the hierarchy, when John Scotus Erigena, for attempting to re-unite Platonism and Christianity, had been anathematized by Nicholas I. as a pantheist and driven into exile at Oxford. And thereafter her whole domain had been fenced out of the Church as mere profane learning, or invaded only to be conquered, until every province was reduced to the most abject subservience.

In Logic the dialectic of Aristotle was indeed used, but used only upon the set problems of orthodoxy, and any deflection in mere form as well as matter was enough to draw down the anathemas of the Church. Roscelin of Compiègne, the founder of the sect of nominalists, who held that universal ideas are but words, was arraigned as a tritheist, and only escaped death by recantation. William of Champeaux, the founder of the sect of realists, who held the opposite theory that universal ideas are the only realities, was pursued in debate as a pantheist, until he retired discomfited from the schools of Paris; and Peter Abelard, the proud lover of Eloise and great dialectical champion of Christendom, who had vanquished both of these disputants, having at length, in his "Sic et Non," dared to exhibit the problems of faith as paradoxes of reason, was forced to cast his own works into the fire, and condemned to obscurity and silence. To such an extent did these mere logomachies prevail that for centuries afterwards the schools were rent with their feuds, and Europe was at length convulsed with bloody wars and persecutions.

In Metaphysics the system of Aristotle was allowed, but only in subordination to the traditional divinity, and any specu-

lations deviating from that standard were watched with the most jealous scrutiny. Almaric of Bena, having advanced views bordering, as it was supposed, upon pantheism, was expelled from his chair in the University of Paris. David of Dinanto, a pupil of Almaric, who went farther than his master, was likewise degraded, and his writings and followers delivered over to the civil arm. And when it was discovered, to the consternation of the Church, that these heresies had been imbibed from certain works of Aristotle, which had drifted into Europe from Arabia on the ebbing tide of the Crusades, that great master himself was for a time arraigned and his metaphysics forbidden from the very council of the Lateran. It was not until the system had been purged of its Arabian glosses and brought into complete subjection to the faith by the greater schoolmen who came afterwards, such as Albert and Aquinas, that these suspicions were allayed and the Stagyrite at length admitted to the seat of Augustine as "the Philosopher" pre-eminent in the schools.

In Physics, except so far as they also could be summed up in the Church cyclopædia, there remained nought but the forbidden arts of magic and sorcery; and the soundest divines, if addicted to them, could not escape the dark imputation. Sylvester II., a renowned physicist of the tenth century who had studied Aristotle in the Moorish schools of Cordova, was universally believed to have won St. Peter's chair through a compact with the prince of darkness; and the legend long ran, that his tomb exuded with moisture and the bones rattled within, whenever a Pope was about to die. Simon of Tournay, a popular lecturer of the thirteenth century, who excelled in chemistry and natural philosophy, was charged by the monks with having been smitten with palsy for his profane temerity. And even Albert the Great, for his physical studies, rested under like suspicions, so terrifying Thomas Aquinas with a speaking automaton, that the angel of the schools broke it in pieces with his staff as a very work of the devil. Peter D'Abano, styled the Conciliator for his attempt to harmonize the physical sciences with philosophy, was condemned as a sorcerer and heretic while he was yet dying, and then burned in effigy, his body having been secreted from the impotent

rage of his persecutors. Even as late as the sixteenth century there appeared a learned apology, by the French writer Naudé, for all the great men suspected of the black art, among whom were named the leading physicists of the middle ages.

With Logic thus debased into sophistry, with Metaphysics swallowed up in mere dogmatic divinity, and with Physics left growing wild beyond the pale of the Church, it was not strange that each of the sciences became overrun with the rankest weeds of superstition and error. Mathematics languished into a kind of mystical arithmetic and geometry, stigmatized as magic, until revived by the infidels of Arabia. Astronomy relapsed beyond the earliest Greek science towards Eastern astrology, and was more busy in calculating nativities than eclipses. Chemistry wandered off with Mohammedan alchemy in search of the elixir of health and the philosopher's stone. Geography was still bounded by the narrow horizon of Christendom, and held the antipodes to be mere heathen monsters of which a Christian ought not even to speak. Natural history, except as it survived in the works of the Aristotelian Albert, had been freed from the fauns, and naiads and dryads of antiquity only to become infested with dragons, elves, and goblins little removed from the fetichism of savage tribes. Psychology, if it had acquired a spiritual hierarchy of saints and angels rivalling the classical gods and heroes, yet retained with them a mass of legends, relics, and impostures of which a heathen philosopher would have been ashamed. Sociology, in passing from Pagan to Christian Rome, had but unfolded a theocracy before which the claims of the Pharaohs and the Cæsars would together have paled into impotence. And even theology, under the full blaze of revelation, had admitted a Queen of Heaven to her throne, and to her altars, a sacrifice of which the wildest mythology had not dreamed.

The scholastic type of Christian science contained the seeds of its own dissolution, and at length broke in twain, together with the great Roman hierarchy which upheld it. With its decline came the revival of letters, the rise of the inductive logic, the revolt of reason from authority, the growth of free institutions, and the ascendancy of the industrial spirit, as the main causes of our modern culture.

The Reforming Age of Christian Science.

(A. D. 1400—1900.)

In the age of the reformers, the long bondage of theology and philosophy burst into a rupture, the one assailing and the other recoiling, until both science and religion have been brought to bay in our own times as for a last pitched battle. We must trace these antagonistic movements separately from their remote beginnings in the previous age towards their extreme results in our own day.

Theology was the first to take the offensive, and assail philosophy. She had indeed, as St. Clement declared, only admitted that pagan stranger as a Hagar into the household of faith and, now that the subtle handmaid was becoming a rival, hastened to drive her back into the wilderness. Long before Protestantism had a name, the first risings of the philosophic spirit, in the speculations of John Scotus and Almaric, had been discerned, as if with jealous foreboding, and bitterly resisted. As early as the thirteenth century, the great friar Bacon, whose physical experiments and speculations might all but eclipse his more famous namesake, but who only terrified his own age as the Wizard Doctor, after vainly protesting against the reigning intolerance in his treatise on the Nullity of Diabolical Magic, had been forced to spend the last ten years of his life within the dungeons of Paris; and Raymond Lully, the Enlightened Doctor and Great Inventor of the Arts, who strove to reorganize the whole Christian science of the time and enlist it in a grand logical crusade against heathen error, after encountering the contempt of Christendom, had fallen a martyr to his wild dream among the Moors of Africa. In the fourteenth century, Durand of Clermont, the Most Resolute Doctor, who dared to introduce into the schools a general independence of sects, authorities, and systems, had been treated as an apostate by the brethren of his own order; and William of Occam, the Invincible Doctor, who revived the long-forbidden logic of Roscelin, and braved the whole scholastic class with an ironical scepticism, as well as by revolutionary appeals to princes and people, had fled over Europe everywhere persecuted but not destroyed. And at length, to-

wards the close of the fifteenth century, the disciples of Durand and Occam, by papal and royal edicts, had been expelled from the universities of France and forced into alliance with the followers of Luther and Melancthon in Germany. It was not strange, therefore, in such a state of parties, that a general persecution should have been enkindled, not merely against the divines who were reforming religion, but also against any philosophers who were emancipating science. History shows us at this time, here and there, a martyr of the revived school of Plato. Pico of Mirandola, the Phœnix of the Age, who convoked a grand philosophical council at Rome, and all but sacrificed his coronet to his piety, was everywhere calumniated as a sorcerer and fanatic and driven to a premature grave. Peter Ramus, who rose from the position of a servant to that of a professor in the College of Navarre, and whose "New Logic," as afterwards edited by our own Milton, became a text-book throughout Europe, was harassed for years in his chair, banished, and at last brutally slain in the massacre of St. Bartholemew. And Giordano Bruno, the guest of Sir Philip Sydney, the critic of Shakspere and the friend of Luther, an academic knight-errant who became pupil and master by turns in all the schools, was expelled as a heretic from Geneva and burned as an atheist at Rome. At the same time, there were not wanting martyrs of the reformed school of Aristotle. Bernardin Telesius, a great Italian thinker, who was the first to attack the scholastic logic in a Baconian spirit, was pursued with calumnies which hastened his death, and afterwards canonized only in the Index Expurgatorius of the Inquisition. Julius Vanini, a paradoxical freethinker, as he has been called, whose "Amphitheatre of Providence" had been avowedly written against atheism, was himself condemned as an atheist to the flames, and has not yet recovered from the infamy of his fate. And Thomas Campanella, a contemporary of Bacon, whose reform he anticipated, and of Galileo, whom from his prison he defended, was seven times tortured and immured in more than fifty different prisons.

But it was when these new philosophical doctrines began to penetrate among the more practical investigators of the

several sciences, and to show their fruits in the grand discoveries of modern times, that the parties, as it were, came into close quarters, and the most bitter conflicts ensued. Theology by this time had become rash enough to forsake the vantage-ground in her own domain, and pursue her antagonist into a region of irresistible facts, where her war of dialectical notions could no longer be waged, and she was sure to meet only with repulse.

Geography was the field on which the first of these battles was fought. Since the days of Cosmas, in the sixth century, it had been the orthodox faith that the earth was a sea-girt plain, beyond which no mortal could pass; and when in the eighth century Virgil or Feargil, of Ireland, had revived the pagan notion of antipodal races on the other side of the globe, all Christendom rang with the quarrel. Boniface, the Apostle of Germany, found it inconsistent with his scheme of missions to imagine in such a nether world other heathen than those to whom he was preaching the gospel, and invoked a missive from Pope Zachary, which put the dangerous heresy at rest. But, now that bold voyagers from Spain were actually seeking new lands beyond the seas, and sailing to the West in hope of returning by the East, it seemed that the very anger of Heaven had been defied. Columbus, after vainly pressing his suit from one royal court to another, had at length to embark for the new world, with the Council of Salamanca invoking the anathemas of patriarchs, prophets, apostles, and fathers upon his impious daring. Magellan, as he sailed through the straits and beneath the stars, which still bear his name, over the wide Pacific, could only solace himself amid the horrors of the long voyage by reflecting that, though the fathers held the earth to be flat, yet her shadow in the moon's eclipse was round, and after incredible hardships at last fell a martyr in sight of his goal. And even when the grand discovery was complete, the new hemisphere was but claimed as a conquered domain of the Church, and its helpless tribes with their crude civilization exterminated as out of the pale of the Adamic races.

Astronomy next opened a still wider and more hotly-contested field. It had been taught from the time of Justin Martyr, that the crystalline heavens revolved around the solid

earth, forming thus a wonderful camera for the abode of man; and though, in the fifteenth century, the Pythagorean doctrine of the solar system had been recalled by Nicholas of Cusa, yet in the absence of any proof, it had been dismissed as an exploded error of antiquity; and even after mathematical reasonings had been advanced at a later period, by the great Nicholas Copernicus, in his treatise on the "Revolutions of the Celestial Orbs," the hypothesis, as it was called, had been actually allowed for half a century in the universities of Italy as a sort of paradox of science not likely to disturb the popular faith. But now that the telescope of Galileo was affording sensible evidence of the motions of planets and satellites around the sun, and his "Sidereal Messenger," announcing the grand discovery to the whole world, it seemed to the guardians of the Church that the very earth was about to be torn reeling from its centre, and all men's opinions revolutionized with it. Cardinal Bellarmin, the General of the Inquisition, at the head of a council of theologians, pronounced the Copernican theory heretical and false, and Pope Paul V. solemnly anathematized it as an opinion that must neither be taught nor defended. And the Synod of Dort echoed back the fulminations of the Vatican. Every school-boy knows how Galileo, gray-haired and worn with suffering, was brought from a dungeon and perhaps from torture, before the grand tribunal, and there, on his knees, with his hands upon the Holy Gospels, compelled to abjure the opinion of the earth's mobility as erroneous, heretical, and contrary to Scripture. The heroic Kepler, whilst pursuing the discoveries of Galileo, with the speculations in his "Harmonies of the Universe," was likewise persecuted in Catholic and Protestant countries by turns. And even when Newton had completed the whole masterly demonstration, his immortal work was placed in the forbidden list of the Inquisition, and for a century afterwards proscribed in the universities of Spain. In fact, it is not many years since the name of Galileo was expunged from the catalogue of heretics, or the monument of Copernicus allowed to have a characteristic epitaph.

Geology, anthropology, and other sciences were not assailed until later times. Meanwhile, too, the state of parties

was changing. The spirit of religious persecution was melting away before the growing tolerance of the age. The Church was rent into two great hostile fragments; Catholicism was forced back into closer alliance with the patristic and scholastic systems; Protestantism was organized only in scattered sects amid polemical feuds; Infidelity was secretly spreading on all sides from the leaders to the ranks, both Catholic and Protestant; and thus at length Theology, true Theology, like the remnant of an invading army broken by repulse, dissension and mutiny, was forced to retreat into her own domain, where she has since been engaged in building apologetical bulwarks around the essential faith.

Philosophy, however, did not always remain on the defensive, but at length recoiled against theology. Even in her most abject state, she but lay crouched under the foot of that stern mistress as a sullen sphinx whose riddles had not been solved; and no sooner did she gain her freedom than she seemed about to turn and devour her conqueror. Long before infidelity dared appear, there had been heard through the dialectics of Roscelin and Abelard, as in unconscious menace, suppressed murmurs of the sceptical spirit. As early as the fifteenth century Nicholas of Cusa, in his "Apology for Learned Ignorance," had assailed the foundations of all knowledge, divine as well as human; and John Wessel of Gröningen, the Light of the World and Master of Contradictions, had unmasked the scholastic sophistry and even foretold a returning dawn of common sense and reason. And in the first part of the sixteenth century John Reuchlin had rescued Jewish learning from the destroying hands of the monks, with a triumphant exposure of their ignorance and bigotry; Agrippa of Nettesheim, in his "Vanity of the Sciences," had scourged their conceit and pedantry with cynical invective; and Erasmus of Rotterdam, in his "Praise of Folly," had turned upon them the contempt of the age in sallies of satirical humor. But it was not until the Reformation had fully effected the liberation and independence of philosophy, that she began to be drawn into alliances hostile alike to Catholicism, to Protestantism, and to Christianity itself. Hitherto she had moved obsequiously within the pale of the

Church, often in the disguise of the most demure orthodoxy, and never beyond the restraints of virtue; now she was emerging upon the broad stage of the world, with soldiers, civilians, and nobles in her train, and among them were some who only abused their freedom in her name or concealed their unbelief with her charms. It was in this period, whilst the ancient schools were yet lingering, flourished Pomponatius of Mantua, an Aristotelian infidel, who masked his impiety and vice under outward reverence to the Church; Montaigne of Bordeaux, a Pyrrhonic sceptic, whose sprightly "Essays," more pagan than Christian, have been styled the breviary of free-thinkers; and Herbert of Cherbury, a Platonic theist, in whose "Religion of the Gentiles" the highest form of classic virtue was strangely blended with the fervor of his more saintly brother, the quaint poet of the "Temple." And in the seventeenth century, whilst the modern schools were still forming, appeared Hobbes and Shaftesbury, disciples of Bacon, and the forerunners of English deism; Le Vayer and Bayle, disciples of Gassendi, and the forerunners of French atheism; and Leibnitz and Spinoza, disciples of Des Cartes, and the forerunners of German pantheism. At the same time, long before these philosophical extremes had been reached, the more practical cultivators of science, engaged in special researches, began to be conscious of the rupture which had been growing unwittingly among their theoretical leaders, as was shown at first in a certain tone of studied respect or mock deference which they felt obliged to assume towards the authorities of the Church.

"In theology," said Kepler, "we balance authorities; in philosophy we weigh reasons. A holy man was Lactantius, who denied that the earth was round; a holy man was Augustine, who granted the rotundity, but denied the antipodes; a holy thing to me is the Inquisition, which allows the smallness of the earth, but denies its motion; but more holy to me is truth; and hence I prove by philosophy that the earth is round, inhabited on every side, of small size, and in motion among the stars,—and this I do with no disrespect to the doctors." It has even been questioned whether Galileo was quite the martyr that so often figures in academic oratory,

now that we are told by Roman divines themselves that his recantation was a mere decorous form conceded by one party to the scruples of another. Indeed, it is hinted that the famous saying, "And yet the earth does move," with which he rose from his knees, instead of being the heroic soliloquy of a mind cherishing its conviction of the truth in spite of persecution, may have been uttered as a playful epigram in the ear of a cardinal's secretary, with the full knowledge that it would be immediately repeated to his master. Certain it is at least, that in his "Dialogues on the System of the World," he speaks sarcastically of a "wholesome edict promulgated at Rome which, in order to silence the perilous scandals of the present age, imposed silence upon the Pythagorean mobility of the earth."

It is well known that Descartes only avoided the fate of Galileo, at the hands of Cardinal Richelieu and the Sorbonne, by a prudent reserve respecting his astronomical opinions, which has been more censured than praised. Perhaps even Bruno and Vanini, who at an earlier date had held like opinions, might have escaped martyrdom as philosophers, had they not chosen to brave the ecclesiastical penalties of their speculations. Andrew Vesalius, sometimes claimed as a martyr of science for his sufferings in the cause of demonstrative anatomy, seems to have fallen under the censure of the Inquisition of Madrid as much through misfortune and vulgar prejudice as from any religious intolerance. And Michael Servetus, but for a fatal proclivity to theological speculations and the blasphemy with which he provoked the Council of Geneva, might have been remembered in this more tolerant age chiefly as a discoverer of the circulation of the blood.

But whilst such early harbingers of science avowed no direct hostility to religion, it was not long before some of their successors, of a less devout spirit, were invading, in the name of free thought, its most sacred mysteries. The supernatural facts of Christianity appearing inconsistent with a scientific conception of nature, were treated by them as mere inherited fables of antiquity, or classed with feats of magic and sorcery, as if in malicious retaliation for the stigma to which the phy-

sical researches had been so long subjected whilst under the ban of the Church. Shakspere, with a kind of prophetic sagacity, seems to have discerned such scepticism as the rising spirit of his time:

> "They say, miracles are past; and we have our philosophical persons to make modern and familiar, things supernatural and causeless. Hence it is that we make trifles of terrors, ensconcing ourselves into seeming knowledge, when we should submit to an unknown fear."—(ALL'S WELL. Act ii. Sc. iii.)

And soon the movement reached a development which embraced all Europe within its sweep and bore away the most sacred land-marks in its tide.

In England, during the seventeenth century, from the very feet of Bacon and Locke, went forth the school of deists arraying experience against revelation, with the courtly satire of Shaftesbury, the perverse ingenuity of Wollaston the coarse raillery of Mandeville, the elegant verse of Pope, the blighting sarcasm of Bolingbroke, the insidious irony of Gibbon, and the subtle scepticism of Hume. In France, during the eighteenth century, from the same empiricism as inherited from Gassendi and Bayle and pursued by Condillac and D'Alembert, sprang that brilliant coterie of wits, Diderot, Helvetius, Voltaire and Rousseau, striving to organize science against religion in the tomes of the Encyclopædia, at the banquets of D'Holbach and under the patronage of Frederick the Great. And at length, towards the close of the last century, what had begun in a reaction from the English "reign of saints" precipitated the French "reign of terror," and the goddess of reason, in the person of lust, was enthroned at the very altar of the Church.

And thus, in the course of centuries, the positions of the two antagonists had been completely reversed. The faggot of the Inquisition had been exchanged for the guillotine of the Revolution. And theology, having begun with a vain attempt to suppress reason by authority, had ended with a defensive struggle for her own life; whilst philosophy, having begun with a legitimate revolt of reason from authority, had ended with a wild assault against the very citadel of the faith.

The reformation of Christian science has brought with it all the boasted advantages of our modern civilization; on the

one side, in the wake of the scientific movement, the discovery of America, the invention of gunpowder, printing, steam, telegraphy, the manifold marvels of physical art, industry, and culture; on the other side, in the wake of the religious movement, the colonization of America, the growth of popular institutions, the multiplication of presses, schools, and missions, the great moral achievements of piety, charity, and philanthropy. But, at the same time, it has been attended, thus far in its progress, with the incidental evils of an unprecedented sectarianism in religion, infidelity in science, and consequent schism in philosophy, for which no adequate remedies have yet been found.

Reserving such questions for following chapters, we are now ready to collect from our historical review several results which at this point should be clearly fixed in the mind. On glancing back over the path which we have traversed, it will be seen that the course of controversy between the scientific and the religious spirit for the last eighteen hundred years has been growing more and more critical, like the skirmishing which leads to systematic warfare, until at length the field is now cleared, the weapons forged, and the rival interests staked as for a last decisive encounter.

For the field of this warfare, we behold the lines drawn between the Natural and the Supernatural as the respective provinces of science and religion. The region of phenomena, laws, and forces is seized by the former; while that of divine manifestations, causes, and purposes is held by the latter. Never before has this great distinction been brought so boldly into view. In the early ages all religion, Pagan as well as Christian, claimed to be miraculous and divine, and science was as yet too crude and vague to oppose it with the notion of natural law. If there were some of the Greek physicists who had begun to supplant mythologic with scientific views of nature, yet their theories soon died out for want of empirical research or at length became overlaid with patristic traditions. In the middle ages the wildest supernaturalism reigned on every side. Not only was the whole church filled with the shrines and miracles of saints, angels, and martyrs; but the world outside was peopled with demons, fairies, and monsters;

and the few brave spirits who strove to exorcise them with the wand of science were themselves stigmatized as but children of Satan. But, in modern times, with the rise of the inductive spirit, a growing naturalism has been pushing the reign of law against that of caprice, from one set of phenomena to another, until at length it seems to have become an open contest between the scientific and religious conception of the universe as to which shall hold its ground against the other. The great questions to be settled are, whether the Supernatural can be explained and resolved into the Natural; or whether they form distinct and irreconcilable orders of facts; or whether though distinguishable, they may not be analogous and congruous, having proceeded from the same Intelligent Author as but parts of one and the same grand system.

For the weapons of this warfare, we behold Reason and Revelation wielded as the several prerogatives of science and religion. The former claims the human mind as the sole instrument of all knowledge; whilst the latter offers the aid of the divine mind in disclosing much that would otherwise be unknown. And this is a division of functions which has never before been urged with such clearness and jealousy. In the early ages, the fathers sought to recommend the Christian revelation as itself solving the problems upon which all philosophy had hitherto been vainly exercised, and even the infidels of the time were fain to rival the prophets and apostles with a kind of mystic theosophy. In the middle ages, the schoolmen were wont to mingle anathemas with their very dialectics, and chaining reason to the feet of authority set its lessons for it in the writings of the fathers, whilst the book of nature was sealed up as a forbidden volume. But the modern rationalists, turning their Protestant freedom into license, have been invading one region after another lying beyond the natural reach of our faculties, until at length they seem ready to usurp the throne of Omniscience itself. It is plainly mooted, whether Reason is not outgrowing and superseding Revelation; or whether, as diverse organs of the finite intellect and the Infinite Intellect, they are doomed to ceaseless conflict, or whether, however antagonistic, they may not still cooperate as joint factors of knowledge in all fields of research.

And for the issues of this warfare, we behold Civilization and Christianity staked as clashing interests of science and religion. On the one side are the temporal concerns of society, its art, politics, and philosophy; and on the other side are the eternal interests of the individual, his creed, life, and worship. And this, too, is such a rupture of parties as our times alone have witnessed. In the primitive culture, under imperial Rome, the church was in false alliance with the state, worship was wedded to a pagan art, theology was mixed with heathen philosophy, and Christianity embarked in a corrupt civilization. In the mediæval culture, under papal Rome, the state was simply prostrate before the church, art was in bondage to a false worship, philosophy was subdued by theology and civilization overpowered by a corrupt Christianity. But in modern culture since the Reformation, the church has become divorced from the state, art estranged from worship, science detached from religion, and civilization more or less at variance with Christianity. And now it remains to be seen whether the two sets of interests are involved in an exterminating warfare by which the whole existing Christianity and civilization, like the ancient faith and culture, shall be whelmed in a common ruin; or whether, as science becomes reconciled to religion, art shall be resolved into worship, the state be merged in the church, and a new Christian civilization prevail over heathen barbarism throughout the earth.

CHAPTER II.

MODERN ANTAGONISM BETWEEN SCIENCE AND RELIGION.

The first view of a distant battle-field could only astonish and bewilder any one wholly unacquainted with the plan of the action. It would matter not how well he had studied the causes of the conflict or the great interests at stake. If he knew nothing of the opposing forces there arrayed, of their orderly disposition over the field, and of their successive manœuvres, he would be at a loss where to look for friend and foe, or how to estimate the ebb and flow of the struggle; and there would appear before him nought but one wide scene of tumult, filled with hurrying crowds, the smoke and din of arms, confused war-cries, heroic charges and desperate repulses, without intelligible aim or result.

And so it would be a sufficient reason, were there no other, for our proposed sketch of philosophical parties in modern times, that it may tend somewhat to relieve this whole subject of its vagueness and obscurity. So long as any opinion or movement is discussed in the abstract, under the dry forms of logic, it will lack that freshness and interest which it acquires when it passes from the region of theory into that of practice, and becomes concrete in a man or a party espousing and defending it. We are, indeed, only beating the air while we contend against notions which no one has ever thought of holding, or make distinctions which as yet appear purely hypothetical and impracticable; but if we can show all the possible shades of opinion concerning a question to be also actual; if

we can cite well-known writers and systems as exemplifying them; if we can even group together the great leaders of modern thought, with their respective followers, as already taking sides upon that question, in each of the sciences on the battle-ground of philosophy; in a word, if to our review of past conflicts between Religion and Science we can now add a survey of the present parties issuing therefrom, and of the controversies still pending between them, we shall then have before us the living men and interests of our own historic period and the actual stage whereon we, too, are to perform our several parts.

Moreover, the popular discussion of the relations of science and religion has already become charged with polemic terms and phrases, the military metaphors of attack, defense, defeat and victory, which a severe taste may lay aside when we come to the higher philosophic problems, but which can help us to the vivid impressions and sharp distinctions needed at the outset of our inquiry. Such imagery is the more striking and timely in a generation grown familiar with the battle scenes of a great civil war, so wide in its area and so complex in its aims and issues.

Now, although there may have been as yet nothing like extended organization or concert underneath the vast medley of modern philosophical opinions respecting the great question before us, yet we shall find that, throughout the educated mind of the age, that mind which garners the past and forecasts the future, there has been a steady, silent growth of feelings and beliefs which at least admit of being defined, compared and estimated. We may see them reflected and contrasted in all modern literature so plainly that the whole community of the learned, from our present point of view, will appear marshalled into parties or classes, in some one of which every leading school, system and opinion may be found.

Of such parties, the two most marked are those who are averse and those who are inapt to the great work of harmonizing the knowledge of man with the knowledge of God; and these parties are again subdivisible according to the kind and degree of such aversion or unfitness. So that, as we proceed, four distinct classes will emerge into view, in the order in

which we name them: 1st. The Extremists, who would render science and religion hostile and exterminant. 2d. The Indifferentists, who would leave them separate and independent. 3d. The Impatients or Eclectics, who would combine them prematurely and illogically. 4th. The Despondents or Sceptics, who would abandon them as contradictory and irreconcilable. And each of these classes will divide into wings, or correspondent groups of scientists and religionists, according as the point of departure taken is scientific or religious in thus variously treating the two interests.

It should here be emphasized, and hereafter be borne in mind, that these four classes are to be viewed as philosophical parties and to be charged with philosophical errors or vices to which religionists as well as scientists are liable, and for which both are to be alike condemned, according as they may severally destroy, divide, confuse or mar the two vitally connected portions of truth and logically related bodies of knowledge known as science and religion. The avowed aim of this treatise, as set forth in its title, is philosophical rather than apologetic or evidential as to the Christian faith, though surely it could put no apologetic interest in peril by appealing to right reason, nor wholly lack evidential value in seeking to harmonize human with divine knowledge. The reader who fancies that he cannot pursue such an aim without harm to his faith is warned at the threshold. It may be best for him to let philosophy alone and stay contented in that one of the four classes to which he belongs, as a mere apologete defending true religion against false science; or as a strict dogmatician, constructing revealed truths without regard to scientific facts; or as a religious eclectic, blending dogmas and hypotheses together; or as a religious despondent, holding both in contradiction; or simply as an earnest Christian, not caring too much for either, but caring more for the essential truths which they involve. There would be nothing unsafe or ignoble in any of these positions, and he would find himself in much good company. But if at any time he should be seized with the philosophic impulse, the passion for wisdom, the intellectual craving for unity of truth and completeness of knowledge, he would then need to inquire into the terms of a philo-

sophic settlement of the great question before us. The extremists should first claim his attention.

To the extremists belong such religionists and scientists as depart towards the extremes of mutual opposition, the one by forcing revelation into the province of reason, and the other by forcing reason into the province of revelation. They are the poles apart as to every question into which Scripture and Science can enter. They insist, each against the other, upon exclusive jurisdiction throughout the entire domain of truth; or, if they admit any common ground, it is to be viewed as a battle-field, in which there can be neither peace nor truce, but only deadly warfare until one or the other is exterminated. In short, they are the men who carry the black flag in the field of philosophy.

Let us glance more particularly at their respective positions, state some of the controversies pending between them, and estimate their common errors.

On the one side is the religious extremist or extreme religionist, who would invade the whole province of reason. The Scriptures he takes to be a revelation, not merely in respect to strictly theological questions, but also in respect to such purely scientific questions as the construction of the material universe, the formation and antiquity of the globe, and the physical and psychical organization of mankind. The allusions of the sacred writers to such matters are wrought by him into a kind of scientific creed which he is ready to maintain in defiance of all opposing theories, and to bind upon the conscience as pure dogma or mystery of faith; and even when his interpretation runs athwart discovered facts, rather than change it, he is fain to suppose a miracle wrought where one would have been as useless as improbable. Theology is for him a stern mistress of the sciences, rather than their adored queen, and holds them in abject pupilage at her feet.

On the other side is the scientific extremist or extreme scientist, who would invade the whole province of revelation. The natural reason he deems competent to deal, not only with scientific questions, but even with the high theological problems of creation, atonement, and judgment; of duty, destiny, and eternity. By means of its crude surmises he frames a

kind of theological theory, which he weighs against all inspired teaching, and claims to support with purely natural evidence; and when any of his discoveries or speculations appear inconsistent with a received interpretation of Scripture, he is in haste not merely to unsettle that interpretation, but to impugn the very fact of inspiration itself, together with the entire doctrinal system which it upholds. Science becomes in his hands a crazed parricide of Theology, rather than her sane daughter, and with every new discovery aims a reckless blow at the very breasts which nurtured it.

We have already found examples of this ultraism, under each of its antagonistic phases, very early in the history of Christian science, but the spirit has by no means died out in modern times, having in fact acquired a momentum from its past conflicts which is already carrying it to the wildest extremes. This will appear by briefly recalling the chief features of the successive epochs as before reviewed. During the age of the Gentile philosophers, we have seen that religion and science dwelt apart in a state of local seclusion, and could not as yet even appreciate each other's mission: it had become the characteristic trait of their representative races, that the Jews required a sign and the Greeks sought wisdom. During the age of the first Christian converts, science and religion met as strangers, mistaking each other for foes and waging a death struggle for pre-eminence: it was then that the Christians despised philosophy as the wisdom of the world, and the philosophers despised Christianity as a superstition of the Jews. During the age of the Greek fathers, philosophy had subjugated theology, and religion became corrupted with false science: it was then that Origen sat at the feet of Plato, blending Pagan speculation with Christian doctrine. During the age of the Latin schoolmen, theology had subjugated philosophy, and science became corrupted with false religion: it was then that Aristotle sat at the feet of Augustine, weaving Christian tradition into Pagan learning. During the age of the reformers, theology and philosophy were torn asunder, the one assailing with bitter persecutions, and the other recoiling with bloody revolutions; until at length amid the confusion of parties which has ensued, we behold at the one extreme a

species of bigotry which assumes the name of religion, and at the other a form of infidelity which masks itself in the garb of science. And now the classes first to be surveyed are those who simply accept these extremes which history has precipitated upon us and drive them to their final consequences, as we shall proceed to show, not merely in each of the sciences, but throughout the whole domain of philosophy, and ultimately into the most practical spheres of civilization.

In this sketch the terms infidel and apologist will be used in their received sense, to denote respectively the assailants and defendants of revealed religion as distinguished from mere natural religion or irreligion; and the aim will be to trace impartially that conflict between them which has been presented on the scientific side by such writers as Baden Powell, Lecky, Theodore Martin, Lange, Draper, and Andrew White; on the religious side, by such writers as Farrar, Lechler, Bartholmèss, Ebrard, Hettinger and Luthardt; and on both sides, by the numerous writers who have treated of special religious controversies in the different sciences. It need scarcely be premised that the few infidels who have perverted science are no more strictly representative than the few apologists who have disgraced religion; and that taken together they form but inconsiderable factions in contrast with the true votaries of either interest.

Entering first the field of the physical sciences, we shall there behold the battle raging in one science after another, in astronomy, in geology, in anthropology; from one country to another, from Italy to England, to France, to Germany, to America; through successive generations, like a hereditary feud which lingers after its original authors may have been forgotten.

The Conflict in Astronomy.

From the rational side of astronomy there have been repeated attacks against the revealed doctrine of the heavens. At the dawn of the science it was perverted to infidel uses. Pomponatius, in a work on natural philosophy, while yet the Ptolemaic system reigned, blended it with astrological views of planetary influence, which were at variance with the Mosaic

doctrine of signs and seasons, and subversive of the whole miraculous element in Christianity. Bruno, as an early advocate of the Copernican theory, admitted before the University of Oxford, that it was incompatible with the Scriptures, and sought to base its discovery of innumerable worlds in a kind of materialistic pantheism, for which as yet no other name than atheism had been found. Campanella, though afterwards a zealot for the papacy, wrote an apology for Galileo, which caused him to be classed with the assailants of Christianity. And the cruel persecution of these first martyrs of science is explained, though surely not justified, by the sarcastic and often contumacious tone which they assumed towards sacred subjects and authorities.

The English free-thinkers, however, could more safely array the new astronomy against revealed religion. Foulke Greville seems to have held a symposium for the liberal discussion of the Copernican system, which Bruno has fully reported under the suggestive title, "An Ash-Wednesday Feast." Shaftesbury, in his "Characteristics," argued that the apparent lack of final cause or intelligent design throughout the infinity of worlds, made the earth an insignificant exception, and formed an overwhelming argument on the side of atheism. Bolingbroke, according to Whewell, ridiculed the Newtonian theory of gravitation, as only based upon an occult miracle, and for a time misled Pope into the shallow sneer:

> "Philosophy that reached the heavens before,
> Shrinks to her hidden cause and is no more."

Thomas Paine, in his "Age of Reason," scoffed at the idea of a redemption of our little world by an incarnate God, as utterly discredited by the grandeur of the Creator and the immensity of His creation.

But it seems to have been reserved for some of the French astronomers to give the science an all but infidel expression. Bernard Fontenelle, the brilliant Secretary of the Academy, who wove its laurels at the same time that he dispensed its learning, composed his elegant "Dialogues on the Plurality of Worlds" in a thoroughly undevout spirit, suggesting the doubts which were to be more coarsely expressed by

Paine. Lalande, another popular astronomer of the time, proclaimed atheism in the Pantheon with the red cap on his head; and in the preface to his treatise classed Derham's Astro-theology, and all such religious writings upon the celestial scenery, with Fontenelle's Dialogues, as mere amusing speculations. La Place, the worthy successor of Newton in everything but his piety, surmised in his "Celestial Mechanics" that the solar system might have been more advantageously adapted to human welfare; and when asked by Napoleon why there was no mention of a God in his "System of the World," replied, that he no longer needed that hypothesis. And as if to complete this cycle of impiety, Auguste Comte, in his Popular Astronomy, has dared to pronounce the grand theme of the Psalmist obsolete, by affirming that the heavens declare no other glory than that of Hipparchus, Kepler, Newton, and all those who have aided in establishing their laws.

At length such undevout astronomy has been pushed to its mad extreme by the German rationalists of our day. Ballenstedt, in his shallow work on the primitive world, renewed the deistical objections drawn from the infinite extent of the universe as contrasted with the obscure speck which man inhabits; and Bretschneider declared that, by the overthrow of the old Ptolemaic system, all the distinctive doctrines of the Christian religion, the incarnation, atonement, ascension, final judgment, heaven and hell, have fallen to the ground like the play-houses of children in a storm. Carl Michelet, consistently with his pantheistical idealism, has maintained in his Lectures on Divine Personality and Human Immortality, that there is no God and no spirit outside of our planet, and that sun, moon and stars are bare rocks of light, floating in the heavens, and serving but as tapers along the development of the Hegelian philosophy. And David Strauss, in both his earlier and later works, treating of the Christian Faith in its conflict with modern science, declares that the discovery of other stellar universes beyond our little Copernican system, has given the finishing blow to the whole Jewish and Christian conception of heaven with its throne and angels, and left naught but a crowd of dissolving suns and planets, amid which man must live and die, literally without God and without hope in the world.

From the revealed side of the science, however, quite as frequent attacks have been made upon the rational theory of the heavens. No sooner had Copernicus published his treatise than it was placed in the Index of prohibited works for censure, as both false in philosophy and contrary to the Holy Scripture. Froidmont of Antwerp, under sanction of the Theological Faculty of Louvain, defended this decree of the Inquisition in a work styled "Anti-Aristarchus," with citations from the Scriptures and fathers, and supposed scientific objections; such as that the wind would always blow from the East, and buildings fly off the earth, if it were in rapid revolution. A learned but bigoted Catholic, Schoppius, who witnessed the martyrdom of Bruno, wrote to a friend, with sardonic humor, that the unhappy man had gone to relate in those worlds which he imagined, how the Romans treat impious men and blasphemers. Father Caccini received Church promotion for preaching a denunciatory sermon against Galileo from the punning text, "Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven?" Cardinal Bellarmin, with other learned doctors of the Inquisition, brought against him the theological argument, that his theory would subvert the whole Christian scheme of salvation, especially the doctrines of the atonement and incarnation, by robbing the earth of its moral importance as the centre of the world between heaven and hell, and by suggesting other races in the planets, who were not descended from Adam, and for whom Christ had not died. The Jesuit, Melchior Inchofer, pronounced the opinion of the earth's mobility the very chief of heresies, most abominable and pernicious, less to be tolerated than an argument against the existence of God or the immortality of the soul. Bossuet declared his adhesion to the Ptolemaic system as alone Scriptural and orthodox, even after the discoveries of Galileo, Kepler and Newton had been almost everywhere accepted. And from that day to this, in order to save the dogma of infallibility, Catholic apologists, such as Marini, De l'Epinois, and De Bonald, have been striving to shift the blame from the Church to Galileo, from the Cardinals to the Pope, from the Pope to the Cardinals, from both to Holy Scripture itself.

But the German and French Protestants were not less

rash in their apologetics. Luther, with characteristic bluntness, denounced Copernicus as an upstart astrologer, who sought notoriety by trying to overturn the whole science of astronomy; as if the earth could revolve around the sun, when the Scriptures tell us that Joshua commanded the sun to stand still, and not the earth. The mild Melancthon, in his "Elements of Physical Doctrine," not only reasoned against the Copernican theory with Scriptural and scientific arguments, but held that the civil authorities ought to suppress such a wicked and atheistical opinion. Calvin introduced his commentary on Genesis by stigmatizing as utter reprobates those who would deny that the circuit of the heavens is finite and the earth placed like a little globe at the centre. The orthodox Turrettin, while yet Newton was completing the demonstrations of Kepler, issued from Calvin's chair a "Compendium of Theology," in which, with a scholastic array of proof texts, objections and answers, he argued that the heavens, sun and moon are in motion, but the earth is at rest. And in the same controversy appeared a crowd of more obscure writers, Klausing, Hollman, Möller, Hensel, maintaining the undoubted motion of the sun as the only Christian astronomy and denouncing the Copernican hypothesis as heathenish, unscriptural and godless.

The English apologists, too, were still reckless, though they entered the battle with a better knowledge of the field. A learned layman, John Hutchinson, in a collection of works with such opprobrious, but significant titles as "Moses' Principia" and "Moses without the Principia," led a party of Cambridge divines against Newton himself on the very theatre of his triumphs. Dr. Samuel Pike, of the same school, published a "Sacred Philosophy," in which he aimed to extract from Holy Scripture the true principles of natural philosophy, in opposition to the Principia of Newton. Numerous Hutchinsonian commentators, such as Bishops Horne and Horseley and President Forbes, have also criticised the Newtonian theory in a more or less polemic spirit. Dr. John Owen, the great Puritan preacher, termed the Copernican system a delusive and arbitrary hypothesis, contradicted by the obvious sense of the Scriptures and irreconcilable with their

teachings. The founder of Methodism, John Wesley, in a sermon on the VIIIth Psalm, after Derham and Huyghens had associated a plurality of worlds with revealed truths, termed that opinion the palmary argument of infidels, and declared he would doubt it, even though it were allowed by all the philosophers in Europe. Professor De Morgan includes in his "Budget of Paradoxes" a variety of anti-Copernican treatises, all written in the supposed defence of Biblical truth. Indeed, it was not long since a Mr. Ferdinand Fitzgerald gravely proposed to establish in opposition to the Newtonian astronomy, a league, a journal and a system of scientific surveys, with the view of demonstrating that the Bible-earth is not a rotating globe, but a flat, motionless plane. And though by this time all Christian literature has become leavened by the new astronomical ideas, and enriched with magnificent proofs and illustrations of the divine glory in the heavens, yet now and then may still be heard mistaken protests, like the idle shots of a retreating army.

Astronomy has thus been made a battle-ground by both parties of extremists for nearly three centuries, until every part of the science has been fought over and contested; sometimes with infidel triumphs, which have been no gain to science, and sometimes with apologetic defeats, which have proved better than victories to religion.

The Conflict in Geology.

From the rational side of geology also have come occasional assaults against the revealed doctrine of the earth. The battles in geometry and geography, for the true figure and features of the globe, having been won, terrestrial physics and chemistry began to breed new controversies, from their popular association with witchcraft and alchemy. If great divines, like Pope Sylvester, Albert of Bollstadt, and Roger Bacon could be charged with Satanic art for their pursuit of these sciences, it was surely not surprising that less orthodox physicists who dabbled in magic, such as Cardan, John Baptist Porta and Leopold de Medici, should suffer the same persecution, or escape it only by hypocritical disguises. And especially would this be so, when physical research began to bear

upon palæontology. Sir Charles Lyell suggests, that the early Italian geologists, Vallisnieri, Scilla and Generelli, who held views of minerals, fossils and strata inconsistent with the received Mosaic cosmogony, did not come into collision with the Church authorities, because they practiced a dissimulation warranted by the fate of Galileo, if not actually tolerated by the Papal court.

There was afterwards, however, less need of such reserve among the so-called brave spirits of the French Academy. Buffon, indeed, may have somewhat compromised his well-known naturalism, by declaring, in his guarded recantation to the Sorbonne, that his "Theory of the Earth" was not opposed to the writings of Moses, but only offered as a pure philosophical supposition. But the encyclopædists, Diderot, D'Alembert and D'Holbach strove to organize all the physical sciences so thoroughly in the interest of pantheism and atheism, that Rousseau himself withdrew from their company. Voltaire, finding that orthodoxy claimed the Alpine fossil shells as relics of the Deluge, scoffed at them as mere fantastic freaks of nature, or scollops dropped by returning crusaders, and satirically accused the Scripture geologists, Burnet and Whiston, of destroying and renewing the earth which Descartes had made, as easily as the scene changes in a play.

In English geology but few such infidel missiles would seem to have been hurled directly at the Scriptures. The false Mosaic cosmogonies have been demolished in the interest of religious truth by enlightened divines such as Buckland, Pye Smith and Hitchcock, and devout laymen such as Dawson, Dana, Hugh Miller and Guyot, rather than by freethinking men of science. If the great Scottish geologist, Hutton, connected unscriptural views with his Plutonic theory of strata and his doctrine of the indefinite antiquity of the globe, they are not expressed in his writings, though often charged upon him by his critics. Lyell very seldom spoke of the Biblical geologists, yet evidently relished the peculiar irony which had made Burnet's "Sacred Theory of the Earth" a favorite at the court of Charles II. and pointed Butler's jest in Hudibras,

at the efforts in that treatise to fix the seat of Paradise in the moon or to find the degree of its longitude upon the earth. The trenchant raillery of Bolingbroke at the Mosaic history is renewed by Professor Huxley against the reconcilers of that history with geology, whose task he likens to the stone of Sisyphus; and once he allows himself to speak of Genesis itself as the cosmogony of the semi-barbarous Hebrew, to be classed with the myths of paganism.

And some of the German infidels have still more boldly fought their way with geological weapons to the same extreme opinion. After the rationalistic critics of Scripture, from Eichhorn to Baur, had striven to reduce the hexæmeron, or six days' creation, to a mere pious fraud for the institution of the Jewish Sabbath, or a legendary cosmogony of oriental fancy, it was natural for geologists of a sceptical turn to join in the attack with a cross-fire from the scientific side. Accordingly, Humboldt in his Cosmos, and Burmeister and Vogt, as materialists, in their natural histories of creation, disdained the Mosaic doctrine of a Creator as a mere childish tradition of the people, inconsistent with the eternity of the earth, and sneered at the creative fiats as more like the dramatic edicts of a constitutional prince than a worthy account of the great geological epochs and catastrophes which were proceeding. Schleiden, as an idealist, in treating of the materialism of modern German science, was fain to charge it upon the fables of the so-called Biblical history of the Creation and Deluge, which we are taught from childhood. And Strauss, ever ready to fling any stone, exposed the seemingly unscientific character of Genesis, the creation of vegetation before the sun, of the earth before the fixed stars, of plants and animals in a few hours, and ridiculed the conciliatory schemes of divines as attempts to make a Hebrew seer speak like a modern geologist.

But from the revealed side of the science, meanwhile, have come continual assaults against the rational theory of the earth. As the early geographers, Columbus and Magellan, had been opposed with Scripture texts and church decrees, so the physicists and chemists, such as Porta and Becker, were in their turn accused of practicing the forbidden arts of sor-

cery, or resorting to an alchemy which Solomon had discredited by sending ships to Ophir for gold. After Fracastoro and Scilla began to suggest the marine and animal origin of mountain fossils, the curious objects were still treasured in the Vatican cabinets as debris of Noah's flood, or off-cast moulds of the Creator, left for the trial of our faith. The regular growth of strata by aqueous agencies, as suggested by Vallisnieri, was held to be inconsistent with the dogma of St. Jerome, that the earth had been disordered and cursed for man's sake. And though at the corrupt Court of Clement VII., the Carmelite Friar, Genarelli, could lead the Academicians in ridiculing the Protestant cosmogonies of Burnet and Whiston, yet this was but a truce before the warfare on other fields. The Theological Faculty of Paris had already put chemical science under the ban as a black art, and afterwards condemned the great mineralogist, Bernard Palissy, and other French geologists, for denying the miraculous origin of fossils and the universality of the Flood. The same authorities at a later period censured Buffon's theory of the gradual formation of continents as incompatible with the creative days of Moses, and required him to insert his courteous disclaimer in the next edition of his works. The Protestant geologist, De Luc, in replying to Hutton, prefaced his treatise with remarks upon the infidel tendencies of the science in having become so anti-Mosaical.

But it was among the English apologists that the attack at length grew fierce and desperate. The sacred cosmogonies of Burnet and Whiston, referring the creation to six literal days, and the Deluge to the shock of a comet or some such catastrophe, had become as deeply imbedded in orthodoxy as once were the astronomy of Ptolemy and the Christian geography of Cosmas, and any different views were quickly pronounced heretical and unscriptural. The Edinburgh ministers charged the Huttonian theory of a secular growth and decay of strata with atheism and infidelity, disguised under the pagan notion of the eternity of matter. Devout laymen, such as the distinguished mineralogists, Kirwan and William, also deprecated it as nothing less than an attempt to depose the Almighty Creator from His office. The Wood-

wardian chair of mineralogy, with its Hutchinsonian collections, stood resisting the growing evidence of any organic remains before Adam, as contrary to the Scripture statement that death came into the world by man; and even after the fossiliferous strata had been tabulated, they were still claimed by Granville Penn and M'Farlane as successive deposits of the Flood, or buried ruins of the Fall. The Rev. Mellor Brown, as if to cut the geological knot, desperately declared it his highest conception of creation that fossils, together with living structures, should start into being by a single fiat of Almighty God. And another "English Clergyman," mentioned by Hugh Miller, carried such reasoning to a fit climax by appealing to certain fossils, supposed to have been visibly forming under recent influences, as "created on purpose to silence the horrid blasphemies of the geologists." American apologists, also, such as Professor Stuart of Andover, and Dr. David Lord of the Theological Review, were trying to prove, against the accumulating testimony of Christian geologists in favor of long organic eras, that the earth must have been created in six working days, from morning to evening, in order to lay a foundation for the Jewish and Christian sabbath. At the same time, during all this warfare, the struggling science itself was variously denounced by such writers as a dark art, a forbidden province, an awful evasion of the testimony of Scripture, essentially infidel and atheistic; and scarcely yet have learned pulpits ceased to resound with the sarcastic invective of Cowper, against such as

> "drill and bore
> The solid earth, and from the strata there
> Extract a register by which we learn
> That He who made it, and revealed its date
> To Moses, was mistaken in its age."

Geology, it will be seen, is still in the thick of a battle, which infidels and apologists are waging for its possession, with manœuvres so swift and brilliant, that the lines of offence from science are scarcely formed before they become lines of defence for religion.

The Conflict in Anthropology.

From the rational side of anthropology already a combined attack seems aimed at the whole revealed doctrine of mankind. This complex science, with its roots in natural history and its branches in physiology, ethnology and archæology, could hardly fail to suggest infidel doubts to many minds; and there must, therefore, have been some wide foundation for the mediæval proverb, "Where there are three physicians, there are two atheists." It should also be remembered that medicine itself, as practiced by Arnold de Villa Nuova, was associated in the popular view with Mohammedanism as well as sorcery, and that martyrs of demonstrative anatomy, like Vesalius, had to encounter a vulgar prejudice and instinctive abhorrence quite as much as any mere theological hatred. And moreover, the later anthropological sciences had not begun to trench upon the Mosaic doctrine of races. It could hardly have been mere zeal for scientific truth which prompted Bruno to term Adam the father of the Jewish people alone, when as yet ethnology was unknown; or La Peyrère to appeal from Genesis to pre-adamite tribes in America, before archæology was inquiring into their origin; or De Maillet, in an ironical sketch, to anticipate the transmutationists by depicting animals and men as amphibious products of the Deluge. It has been reserved for our times, and at the outset for American and English writers, to give such doubts a scientific air. Doctors Nott and Gliddon, in their "Types of Mankind," and again in their "Indigenous Races of the Earth," have scattered among valuable memoirs a variety of sceptical objections to the Mosaic doctrine of the human creation, which they term a crude and juvenile hypothesis. Professor Huxley, in his Reviews and Lay Sermons, speaks of the Hebrew Scriptures as the chief obstacle to Darwinism, and regards their view of the creation of man as belonging only to the infancy of science. Sir John Lubbock, though he never directly assails the Biblical anthropologists in his works on pre-historic man and the origin of civilization, has characterized Adam as a typical

savage, in his religion as well as in other respects, and denies the fall of the race from a primitive revelation. Charles Bray has issued a manual of anthropology, in which he collates the chief authorities of the science against the whole Scripture doctrine of man. And the latest German utterances of the school are still more extreme and outspoken. Professor Haeckel of Jena, in a memoir on the genealogy of the human race, maintains that second only to the geocentric error, which made the earth the pivot of the whole physical universe, is the anthropocentric error, which makes man the image of God and central object of the organic creation; and that the latter error has been destroyed by Lamarck, Goethe and Darwin, as was the former by Galileo, Kepler and Newton. Dr. Büchner of Darmstadt, in his "Man of the Past, Present and Future," simply traces the race from an animal, through a savage, into a civilized state, arraying all anthropological research, with sardonic coolness, against the Biblical doctrines of the creation, fall and redemption of mankind. Strauss, with Clapa-rède, has said, he would rather be a perfectionated ape than a degenerate Adam, as one might choose for an ancestor some rising citizen rather than a mere dissolute Count. And Professor Carl Vogt, in his Lectures on Anthropology, as if to defy all religious prejudice, not only denies the special creation of man in the divine image, but, among other profane and indecent retorts of orthodox scorn, dares to classify certain crania of the simian type as Nazarene or Apostle skulls.

At the same time, from the revealed side of the science, the forces are mustering against the whole rational theory of the human race. And as yet, it would seem, with no very formidable array. The great discoveries of antiquarians, from Champollion to Lepsius, are to be opposed with the Biblical chronology of Archbishop Usher, as fixed by act of Parliament. The profound researches of linguists, from Humboldt to Whitney, are to be met with the pious tradition that Hebrew was the language of Paradise, preserved through the confusion of tongues at Babel. And as to the ethnological and physiological questions, there are signs of a recklessness worthy the darkest ages of the Church. As Virgilius, in the eighth century, was all but anathematized for his notion of an-

tipodes, on the ground that it would break the unity of the First Adam, so the guardians of orthodoxy in our day are denouncing Agassiz and Forbes for a theory of co-adamite races, which might really support their own doctrine of a high Adamic covenant, as distinguished from mere inherited sin. The charges of atheism and infidelity, which were hurled at devout naturalists in the middle ages, are now brought as indiscriminately against all Darwinians alike, lay and clerical, Mivart and Brown, Henslow and St. Clair, Peabody and Gray, in spite of their repeated protests. And the efforts of Roman cardinals in the fifteenth century, and French and English theologians in later times, to stir up popular odium against dissections as a desecration of the divine image, and against vaccination and chloroform as an impious evasion of the curse upon man and woman, may find some parallel in the invidious sneers of distinguished divines at the researches of comparative anatomists, though Calvin himself taught lessons of humility from the earthly origin and animal formation of Adam. Archbishop Sumner, in his Records of Creation, speaks of them as having taken an extraordinary pleasure in levelling the broad distinction between man and the brute creation. Dr. Jacobus, in his Notes on Genesis, would seem to concede to them no more valuable aim or attainment than the questionable satisfaction of finding their paternity in the ape. Dr. Delitzsch of Leipsic, in his Biblical Psychology, with a refined disdain which could only have been provoked by the coarseness of a Büchner or a Vogt, hints that they must first have essentially brutalized themselves before they could even entertain their peculiar theories of the animal origin of man.

Anthropology as yet is but a comparatively untrodden field, in which infidels and apologists are only beginning to reconnoitre and skirmish; and it is too soon to judge of their relative strength either for the promotion of true science, or the vindication of sound religion.

Entering next the psychical sciences, Psychology, Sociology, and Theology, where the human interests involved are so much more intense, we shall there find the two extremists, contending still more fiercely, on the field of each science,

from land to land, century after century, like long-embittered foes fighting their battles over again with only a change of tactics and weapons.

If in the physical sciences we have seen infidels but seldom beginning the offensive against their assailants, we shall now behold the warfare reversed, and apologists often put upon the defensive by the most terrible onsets; and whereas the conflict has hitherto mostly appeared in the regions of positive science, of ascertained facts and laws, it will hereafter be found very largely a war of opposing theories and notions, owing to the more imperfect state of the psychical sciences.

The Conflict in Psychology.

From the rational side of psychology there have been incessant attacks upon the revealed doctrine of the soul. Long before the close connections of this science with physiology had been explored, or any fixed mental laws were conjectured, sceptical doubts were broached as to man's immortality and responsibility. The Italian infidels made their attack covertly under a revived Aristotelianism. Pomponatius, the master of the school, taught with the Stagyrite, in a work misnamed the "Immortality of the Soul," that the mind is inseparable from the body and perishable with it, and disingenuously cited Homer, Pliny and Seneca, as examples of virtue without the motives of a future life, whilst himself accepting the grossest practical consequences of his theory. Achillini and Nipho, though adversaries of Pomponatius, would simply have dissolved the individual soul in the general soul of the world. Jerome Cardan, according to Warburton, justified these opinions on the ground of state-policy, arguing that the belief in a vague immortality only destroys the present influence of the good, and gives license to the bad. Cremonini, who wrote upon the senses and the appetites, expressed the growing depravity of the school in the atrocious maxim that vice itself was a privilege of the clergy. And even Pope Leo X. and Cardinal Bembo, are suspected of having hypocritically issued a bull against these heresies, as a mere idle fulmination to blind the populace.

The English infidels made their attack more openly and powerfully with the empiricism of Bacon and Locke. Thomas Hobbes of Malmesbury, the founder of the school, in his various writings on "Human Nature" and "Necessity and Chance," merged the mind in the body as affected and impressed by other bodies through the brain; subjected the will to physical compulsion, and reduced conscience itself to a mere balancing of sensuous pain and pleasure. Dr. William Coward, whose work entitled "Second Thoughts concerning the Human Soul," was ordered to be burned by the common hangman, argued that the traditional notion of an immaterial, immortal spirit united to the body, was a plain heathenish invention and philosophic imposture, as all thought results from mere matter and motion. Anthony Collins, the champion of the free thinkers, not only defended the natural mortality of the soul, but in his "Philosophical Inquiry concerning Human Liberty and Necessity," undermined all moral responsibility, by enchaining the will in mere physical causation. Shaftesbury and Bolingbroke, making ridicule their test of truth, politely sneered at the Christian graces of humility, penitence and meekness, as essentially mean and degrading; while Thomas Chubb coarsely scoffed at future moral awards as no more likely than a Divine judgment of the animals. Bernard Mandeville, a French physician in London, as if to throw off all disguises, in his "Fable of the Bees or Knaves turned Honest," boldly reversed the distinction between right and wrong, by defending the atrocious paradox that private vices are public benefits. And at length this desolating tide of scepticism came to the flood in David Hume, whose essays on the passions, on immortality, and on suicide, reduced man to a mere irresponsible animal, denied all future judgment as impossible and absurd, and held the life of a man at no higher price than that of an oyster.

But the French infidels of the last century even more recklessly overran all morality, as well as spirituality, with the sensualism of Condillac. Claude Helvetius, a literary protégé of Voltaire and the chief propagandist of the school, in his famous treatise on "The Spirit," maintained that the soul is but organized matter, pleasure the chief good, and virtue

and vice due to mere animal sensibility as modified by climate. Julien de La Mettrie, whose "Man the Machine," and "Man the Plant," were publicly burned as offensive to good morals, described the mind as but a piece of perishable mechanism, and deduced without reserve the vilest inferences of the theory in a treatise on the School of Pleasure, or Art of Enjoyment. And at length Baron D'Holbach and his confrères, in their "System of Nature," reduced this mass of sensuality and fatalism to a compend, which Voltaire himself, in a lucid moment, declared to be simply detestable.

And yet the German infidels of our day would seem to have plunged into a still lower and grosser materialism from the idealism of Hegel. Louis Feuerbach, as fiery by nature as by name, well styled the modern Porphyry, taking the brain as the highest product and organ of the absolute reason in the Hegelian dialectic, has sought to identify thought with its phosphorous substance, and gravely argued that we are what we eat; that the future progress of science depends upon a more phosphoric diet than potatoes; and that at death the so-called soul goes down into the dust to become the fresh fuel of life. Carl Vogt, in his "Types of Animal Life," recalling a bold figure of Cabanis, still more grossly describes thought as a mere secretion of the brain, like that of the liver or the kidney; asserts that we have no more power over our intellectual faculties than over such bodily organs; and recklessly denies that there is any such thing as free-will, moral accountability, or any future rewards and punishments. J. Moleschott, in his "Circulation of Life," descends from the stye to the charnel-house, declaring not merely that mind is a mere movement of matter and function of the brain, but that the only immortality is that of the disintegrated body, whose ammonia, carbonic acid and lime have served to enrich the earth, and nourish plants and animals, to feed the brains of other generations of men. And Büchner, in his treatise on "Matter and Force," as if to find a lower depth, after tracing man from the dust to the animal and back to dust, consistently hints that a dying philosopher of the right temper might rather be devoured by crows than have Christian burial.

From the revealed side of the science, meanwhile, there have

been constant recoils against the rational theory of the body. As Plato and Aristotle, by turns, had been anathematized in the Church, so Descartes, with his proffered proofs of immortality, was censured by the Sorbonne and the Synod of Dort; while Locke, with his notion of cogitative matter as a germ of the resurrection, was repudiated by the Cambridge divines. If the infamous works of La Mettrie and D'Holbach were justly condemned to the flames, yet their germinal principles had already been broached by Fathers Gassendi and Condillac, as well as by Hartley and Bonnet, who even sought to combine them with the Christian faith. And at the same time, the defensive weapons which were forged in the Church against the new psychologic theories, often proved less destructive in their attack than in their rebound. The Italian apologists hastily armed themselves with a renewed Platonism. Marsilius Ficinus, chief of the school at Florence, in a treatise on the Platonic Immortality and Eternal Felicity of Souls, held the mind to be a divine energy, or spiritual emanation imprisoned in the body, from which it was to be liberated and resolved into deity by an ascetic life. The two Picos of Mirandola, uncle and nephew, mingled cabalistic or Jewish traditions with the new Platonism, and carried their spiritualistic principles into practice to the extreme of enthusiastic self-sacrifice. And later followers of the school in other countries, such as Paracelsus, Van Helmont, and Fludd, were at length landed in extravagancies akin to modern clairvoyance, animal magnetism and spiritism.

The English apologists more vigorously reinforced the spiritualism of Plato. Ralph Cudworth, the leader of the Cambridge Platonists and chief antagonist of Hobbes, in his "Intellectual System," defined the soul as a plastic mind or intelligent force, moulding and sustaining even the body itself; and afterwards maintained its absolute independence and liberty, in a treatise on Free-will. Henry More, so fastidious an intellectual epicure that he is said to have been ashamed of having a body, not only discoursed apologetically on immortality and free-will, but in a "Platonic Song of the Soul," depicted the future disembodied spirit, indissoluble and yet diffused, luminous and endowed with plastic and percipient powers:

"Like naked lamp, she is one shining sphere,
And round about has perfect cognoscence,
Whate'er in her horizon doth appear.
She is one orb of sense, all eye, all airy ear."

John Smith, another disciple of the same school, added to this picture of the immortal soul that of her future spiritual body, as no mere gross complex of bones and flesh, but her aerial mantle and vehicle. Dr. Samuel Clarke, the redoubtable adversary of Collins and Coward, in order to refute their notion of the natural mortality of the soul, metaphysically distinguished it from the body as an indivisible substance, endowed with an indivisible consciousness, and therefore indissoluble by death. At length Bishop Berkeley, recoiling by his own ponderous blows to the opposite extreme from Hobbes, in his "Dialogue between Hylas and Philonous," (a materialist and spiritualist),went so far as to question the materiality of the whole external world, leaving nothing in the universe but spirits impressing each other with ideas. And other like-minded apologists, such as Norris and Collier, were driven beyond this extreme into a paradoxical denial of the externality as well as materiality of all sensible existence.

The French apologists took refuge in the dualism of Descartes. Blaise Pascal, whose satirical "Letters" have made the very name of Jesuit synonymous with loose ethics, adopting into his theology the Cartesian distinction between matter and spirit as two separate inscrutable essences, consistently depicted the immortal soul as a fallen Lucifer, chained to a body of death. Arnold Geulinx of Louvain, the Calvinistic expounder of Descartes, in his "Annotations," correlated soul and body as two mere passive instruments of Deity, co-acting in thought and sensation, and inferentially resolved the very dictates of virtue into divine decrees. Antoine Arnauld, the great Catholic expounder of the school, in a treatise upon ideas, referred them to the mind as distinguished from matter; derived them from a sort of occult suggestion of God; and based all our knowledge on the divine veracity alone. At length Father Malebranche, the austere monk of the Oratory, who scorned alike the learned and the great, in his

"Search for Truth," degraded the body into a mere animal machine; sublimed the soul into a pure spirit beholding all things in God, their only revealer as well as creator; and disdained even the sensible evidence of an external world, except as confirmed by the Holy Scriptures and the Catholic Church. From such extravagant spiritualism, it was not strange that afterwards there should have come that rebound to the materialism of the Encyclopædia, which the efforts of Bergier, Ploucquet and Lussac could not arrest.

The German apologists meanwhile were entrenching themselves in the monadism of Leibnitz. Christian Wolff, the organizer of the school, assuming the Leibnitzian definition of the soul as a spiritual monad or conscious force, was endeavoring by purely metaphysical proofs to demonstrate the dogmas of its immateriality, accountability and futurity; but since Kant and his idealistic disciples, by their rational criticism, have exposed both the dogmas and the proofs to fresh suspicion and overthrow, it has only remained to repair the fortress from the old arsenals, or defend it with new armaments. Dr. Francis Hettinger, Roman Catholic professor at Marburg, in his Apology for Christianity, has revived the sensitive, vegetative and rational soul of St. Aquinas as substantially expressed in the body, in opposition to the chief scientific authorities of recent materialism. Dr. Luthardt of Leipsic, in his popular Apologetical Lectures, also meets the assaults of Feuerbach, Vogt, and Büchner, with the traditional conception of the soul as a mental, moral and religious principle, involved in the bodily organism, yet essentially independent and superior, as consciousness testifies. Professor Hermann Ulrici, in his masterly treatise on "God and Man," against the psychological materialists, defines the soul as a psychic force blending with the plastic force of the body, and pervading its atomic structure like an atomless fluid, yet with a consciousness ever distinguishing it from the body, from other embodied souls, and from the Divine Spirit. Professor Rudolf Wagner, the distinguished physicist, has charged the current materialism with a non-scientific character and immoral tendency; and having remarked in a convention of naturalists, that he preferred the faith of a collier to the speculation of a

scientist, was assailed by Carl Vogt with a satirical pamphlet entitled, "Collier's Faith and Science," to which he gave the rejoinder, "Knowledge and Faith;" maintaining therein the substantiality of the soul as a sort of ether in the brain, which after death may acquire locomotive power as swift as the light of the sun, together with a capacity for localization, and perhaps even re-incarnation upon earth. Other apologists, by renovating the atomism of Leibnitz, are striving to resolve the body itself into a mere congeries of spiritual forces, or phenomenal manifestation of the soul; while some in their zeal to keep soul and body distinct, are relapsing toward the mechanical dualism of Descartes.

And now, as an antithesis to the wildest materialism on the infidel side, we have the American school of so-called spiritualists, or spiritists, led by the Poughkeepsie seer, Andrew Jackson Davis, and Judge Edmonds, who claim to bring new sensible evidence of immortality and the whole unseen world, by means of telegraphic communications with apostles, saints, heroes and deceased friends, together with materializations of spirit, levitations of matter, and other such phenomena, surpassing the wildest necromancy of the middle ages.

The conflict in psychology, after having been waged for centuries, has at length come to close quarters, and infidels and apologists are fighting hand to hand, as if for the very truth of science and life of religion.

The Conflict in Sociology.

From the rational side of sociology, likewise, have come frequent assaults upon the revealed doctrine of the Church or spiritual organization of society. When this intricate science was unknown and while as yet its various departments, politics, political economy, history of civilization, philosophy of history, were treated as regions of mere human caprice rather than of natural law, there were reckless thinkers seeking to impugn all ethical principles, divine institutions and supernatural Providence. The Italian assault was opened on the field of statesmanship. Nicholas Machiavelli, of whom Bacon, his most charitable critic, has said, that he analyzed the impious and

cruel acts of despots as coolly as a chemist treats of poisons, published a work styled "The Prince," which exhibited Cæsar Borgia as a model, and became the catechism of absolute monarchs; while, in his History of Livy, he broached fatalistic views of social development, and based his ideal state on Pagan rather than Christian Rome. Gabriel Naudé, a French infidel, tolerated at the papal court, is said by Hallam to have taken from Machiavelli the political considerations on state policy with which he sought to justify the massacre of St. Bartholomew. And Campanella, with still more paradoxical boldness, in one of his treatises proposed to the Spanish monarch a universal war for the triumph of the Papacy over Protestant and Pagan nations, and yet in another treatise anticipated the most visionary socialists of our time, with opinions wholly subversive of property, the family, and the state.

The English infidel assault was extended to the wider fields of political science and general history. Thomas Hobbes, who translated Thucydides whilst an exile from the Commonwealth, in hopes of disgusting his countrymen with the evils of democracy, in his treatise well-named "Leviathan," represented the body politic as a huge material corporation without souls and without a spiritual God; the state as mere organized might trampling upon right; the church as but a creature of the state, and society as ever at the alternative of despotism or anarchy. Edward Gibbon, by Byron styled "lord of irony, sapping a solemn creed with solemn sneer," professed to waive the pleasing task of describing Christianity as she descended from heaven, that he might depict the inevitable mixture of error and corruption which she contracted during a long residence upon earth; and in his "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," lavished the most classical English in the language upon the most awful spectacle in history, only to ignore her claims and disparage her charms. And later English writers, such as Godwin, Owen, and Buckle, have made their still more direct attacks upon political order and divine Providence.

The French infidel assault spread through civil history into political economy and social science. Montesquieu, who re-

flected the skepticism of his time in his "Persian Letters," and his speculations upon the "Grandeur and Decadence of the Romans," in his later more celebrated treatise on the "Spirit of Laws," dwelt so impressively on the influence of climate and other physical agencies upon civil institutions, and ignored so entirely divine Providence in human affairs, that the Theological Faculty required him to modify subsequent editions of the work. Volney, whose Catechism of a French Citizen is but the condensed ethics of atheistic materialism, in his "Ruins of Empires" wholly obliterated the supernatural character of Christianity, and rendered all history but a spectacle of hopeless confusion and error. Jean Jacques Rousseau, as eccentric in his politics as he was in his religion, recoiled with sentimental misanthropy from the vices of civilization to an original state of nature or social contract, in which he dreamed of society as re-organized on a basis of savagery and impiety. The Marquis of Condorcet sketched a picture of human progress from barbarism to an imaginary social perfection as effected by mere physical education without Providence and without morality. And at length Auguste Comte, came forward with his "Political Catechism," gravely proposing to re-organize society as a sort of atheistic scientific hierarchy, literally without a king and without a God.

But the great German infidel assault of our day has at last stormed the speculative heights of philosophical history. After Lessing had belittled the whole supernatural element in the divine education of the human race, and Hegel and Schelling had involved universal history in their supposed development of absolute reason, it has been easy for their extreme disciples to deduce the most irreligious views of social progress. Strauss, in his celebrated Life of Christ and the two Bauers, in their histories of doctrine, applying the Hegelian dialectic, have sought to resolve ancient Christianity into a mere philosophical mythology, the successive dogmas of the Church into dry logical formulas, and all accompanying civilization into the scaffolding and refuse of the absolute philosophy. At the same time, the more radical socialists, as led by Arnold Ruge and Schweizer, have been

boldly assailing all fixed institutions, and maintaining that Christianity itself is opposed to the spirit of the age, that theologians are a vanishing race, the Church doomed to become extinct, and the State of the future to do without a religion; while the recent pessimists, Hartmann and Bahnsen, are arguing against all divine purpose in history as well as nature, and exhibiting humanity as but the crowning abortion of the world.

And at length the American infidel assault, still more practical in its aim, has been seeking to undermine the very foundations of social order; not merely by excluding the Church from the State, and Christianity from politics, but by the new socialistic views of the Owens, the emigrant followers of Proudhon, and other European refugees, who would abolish both church and state, property and family, and all divine institutions, in order to reconstruct society upon wholy irreligious principles.

But from the revealed side of the science have followed as frequent recoils against the rational theory of the State, or temporal organization of society. Not only were the doctrines of political reformers concerning civil liberty, from Arnold of Brescia to Cromwell, stigmatized as impious and rebellious; not only were the teachings of political economists respecting interest and capital, from Montesquieu to Bentham, rejected as contrary to the Scriptural rule of usury and the curse of labor; not only were the harmless utopias of socialists, from More to St. Simon, repudiated as caricatures of the Christian community of goods; and not only were the inquiries of philosophic historians for the fixed laws of human progress, from Vico to Draper, denounced as incompatible with Divine Providence and sacred history; but the alternative systems in which great apologetic churchmen entrenched themselves, often proved untenable or were left dismantled in the course of the warfare. The Italian defence was taken on the high ground of a pure theocracy. Cardinal Bellarmin, the great champion of the papacy, who is said to have held the best polemical pen in Europe, in his famous Disputations, described the Church as a vast spiritual corporation, endowed with divine prerogatives, the State as but a vassal of the

Church, and the head of the Church as the vicar of Christ upon earth, entitled to a universal monarchy, both spiritual and temporal, over all earthly kingdoms and nations. And consistent to this hour, the Roman Church still stands protesting against all surrounding civilization as heretical and impious, though her infallible Pope is little more than a state-prisoner in the Vatican. The French defence was taken on the similar ground of a theocratic monarchy. Bossuet, the shield of the Gallican Liberties, not only maintained the divine right of kings as well as popes, with scriptural arguments, but in his celebrated Discourse on Universal History, exhibited to the Dauphin of France all ancient civilizations as successively made tributary to the Catholic religion by a Providence which marched with strides of fate, through falling empires, over the prostrate wills of men. And other apologists of the reactionary school, such as Chateaubriand, De Bonald and De Maistre, have continued to present the same polity as the only bulwark against the evils of modern culture, as they were expressed in the French revolution.

The English defence was taken on the grounds of episcopacy, presbytery and congregationalism. Archbishop Laud, the stern propagandist of prelacy, who blended the divine right of bishops with that of kings, would have reduced the State to a mere supple instrument of the Church; and from the secret star-chamber in which he ruled, embarked in that ecclesiological experiment upon Scottish society, which was to yield the model of a theocratic episcopacy. Alexander Henderson, the author of the Solemn League and Covenant, led his countrymen into that still wilder crusade by which king, lords and commons were to be compacted in uniformity of doctrine and worship under the divine right of presbytery. Sir Henry Vane, returning from the colony of Massachusetts to the commonwealth of England, then published his "Face of the Times," in which he traced the conflict between the seed of the serpent and the seed of the woman, through the rise and fall of four great monarchies, to an approaching Fifth Monarchy, to be established by the second coming of King Jesus, with a community of goods and a reign of saints. And since then, as counterparts of Gibbon and Hume, we have had a

line of apologetic historians, from the learned Prideaux, who strove to exhibit all Gentile civilization as but a course of vindictive Providence on behalf of Christianity, to the recent Theocratic History of Schomberg, who has looked for similar divine interpositions in the annals of English episcopacy; while millenarians, like Cumming, are interpreting current political events as signs of a Messianic kingdom about to befall, with a universal social catastrophe.

The German defence has been taken where the attack could alone be repelled, on the heights of speculative history. In that lofty fortress of the faith, chief among other apologists stood Neander and Ebrard, with their biographies of Christ, and Dorner and Meyer, with their histories of doctrine, defending against Strauss and Baur the supernatural origin and development of Christianity in its distinction from the accompanying civilization, like a beleaguered garrison beset by treason within and foes without, while their allies at a distance were but mocking at the battle as a false alarm, until the same undermining hosts began to spring up beneath their own feet. At the same time, in the region of ecclesiastical history and speculation, the Catholic Leo has been projecting the mediæval theocracy as the Church of the future, while the Protestant Rothe would realize the primitive polity in some ideal Christian republic.

And now, in contrast with these old-world movements, as if to match the most extravagant socialism on the infidel side, we find in American society the wildest experiments in Christian polity; not merely the rank reproduction of all European churches and sects in a fresh struggle for the mastery, but new monster growths of our own soil, such as the hybrid church-state of Mormon, and the theocratic dreams of Millenarians, ever and anon predicting some miraculous re-organization of the world's political system by the return and reign of Christ.

The conflict in sociology, owing to the new and confused state of the science, is less like a battle than a vast ambuscade, where neither infidels nor apologists as yet could meet and range themselves under the banners of science and religion.

The Conflict in Theology.

From the rational side of theology, also, there have been perpetual attacks upon all revealed religion. With the rise of natural theology in the physical and mental sciences, and the growth of the comparative study of religions, have come successive infidel efforts to discredit or disparage the peculiar evidences, doctrines and duties of Christianity. The first form of the attack was that of Italian naturalism. At the dawn of the movement, the great poets, Dante, Petrarch and Boccaccio, more or less consciously, had already leavened Christian literature with pagan elements. Pomponatius, with disguised unbelief, as the chief of the school, in a treatise on the causes of natural phenomena, held with Aristotle, that God, the prime mover, is wholly abstracted from the world in eternal self-contemplation, while the mundane intelligence itself and all other spirits are but physical and mortal. Simon Porta, an advanced disciple of the same school, reduced its doctrines to system in his natural philosophy. Bruno, combining the atomism of Lucretius with the new, more scientific conceptions of nature, represented the universe as an infinite and eternal substance, which he called God, undergoing perpetual metamorphoses in all worlds, through all stages, from lifeless atoms to living orbs. And Julius Vanini, a still more reckless thinker, by the publication of a work entitled "Nature, the Queen and Goddess of Mortals," seems to have torn the mask from the prevalent naturalism, and revealed it as pantheism or atheism.

The next form of the attack which followed was that of English deism. Herbert of Cherbury, as the forerunner of the school, by distinguishing truth from revelation, led the way, with his project of a religion of all nations, comprising only as much of Christianity as it has in common with natural theism. Hobbes, the chief founder of the school, in his Leviathan, admitted the probable existence of God, but only as an incomprehensible material cause of the world, whose blind omnipotence was lodged in the king as head of a body politic, including even the state-religion under the royal prerogative. Bolingbroke, the courtier of the school, advanced a somewhat

more refined conception of God as a physical Creator of the world, displaying in his works the mere natural attributes of power and wisdom; but denied that any moral attributes could be discerned either in nature or in Providence, both of which often appear to contradict true goodness and justice by instances of malevolent contrivance and unpunished vice. Alexander Pope, as the poet of the school, depicted in lines which have the fascination of horror, a stoical Deity,

> "Who sees with equal eye as Lord of all,
> A hero perish or a sparrow fall,
> Atoms or systems into ruin hurl'd,
> Or now a bubble burst, or now a world."

Thomas Chubb, a literary tallow-chandler, with much natural shrewdness, popularized the genteel deism by a series of pamphlets, in which, after the manner of Paine, he attacked the Scriptural representations of Providence as wholly inconsistent with natural ethics. And at length David Hume, in his Dialogues on Natural Religion, accumulated all the sceptical objections that had ever been raised against the existence of a God; denied that we can even conceive such a being, or, indeed, any adequate cause of the world; and declared that the best conception we can form of the universe is that of a huge, growing plant, rather than a work of intelligent design.

The next phase of the attack was that of French atheism. Montaigne and Le Vayer had already raised the spirit of scepticism. Voltaire, the wit and idol of the school, though a professed deist, in his sketch of the Ignorant Philosopher, threw doubts upon the whole argument for a God, admitting it only as good for police; scoffed at Providence under the mock titles of Chance and Destiny; and wrote one of his romances, entitled "Candide," as a satire upon the doctrine of the religious trials of life. Diderot, the popular leader of the school, a sophist and a profligate, who fled from Paris to the protection of Catherine of Russia, in his Philosophical Fragments, openly assailed the belief in a just God as an unnecessary and troublesome tenet, interfering with the pleasures of life. Julien La Mettrie, court philosopher to Frederick the Great, promulged, in his treatise on the Happy Life, the im-

pious creed that men would never be happy until they became atheistic and abandoned the dictates of religion for the appetites of nature. The authors of the "System of Nature" openly avowed the atheism of the school; maintained that though a God might be respected, yet the world alone was to be loved; and argued that more education and courage were all that was needed to make this creed universal. Anacharsis Clootz proclaimed, in the Revolutionary Convention, that there was no other God but Nature, and no other sovereign than the divine people. And at length, after this atheism had been repeated with endless variations, Auguste Comte announced a new so-called religion, having man himself for its only God, and consisting essentially in the systematic worship of humanity.

The final form of attack in our day has been that of German pantheism. Lessing and Jacobi had already revived and imported the speculations of Spinoza upon absolute Deity; and the extreme disciples of Schelling and Hegel, in due time, were couching them under Scripture phrases in place of the Christian theism. Bernard Blasche, of the former school, sought to resolve man into a mere phenomenon or transient image of God, and to make the evil as divine as the good in the government of the world. Carl Michelet, as a strict Hegelian, with his doctrine of absolute personality, would virtually have merged God in the world as having no separate independent existence and coming to consciousness only in man, the true incarnate Christ. Strauss, at the extreme left of Hegel, passed into still grosser pantheism, in his "Old and New Faith," by substituting for the Christian God, as his only object of worship, a law-governed cosmos, or enormous machine of a universe, amid whose jagged wheels and ponderous hammers helpless man may at any moment be seized and crushed to powder. Feuerbach, from the same position, reached a sort of conscious anthropomorphism; maintaining, in his "Essence of Christianity," that man, as the final product of the whole logical development of nature, can find no superior being; that the imagined deity is only an illusory personification of his own human attributes; in a word, that he has but created a god after his own image. Arthur Schop-

enhauer, with still more daring impiety, in his work entitled "The World as Will and Notion," boasted that he had destroyed the last vestige of theism, by showing that both the cosmos and its man-made deity are alike ideal and illusory, the mere phantasm of his brain, an abortive human creation, which by one stroke of the will would collapse into blind force and nothingness. And Eduard von Hartmann, a disciple of both Hegel and Schopenhauer, as if to couple their extreme errors, believes himself to have demonstrated atheism or pantheism by uniting unconscious force and reason throughout nature and history, while in his recent tractate on the "Decomposition of Christianity" he projects a sort of philosophical Buddhism as the universal religion of the future.

Meanwhile, these different forms of European unbelief have now and then found American representatives, from Paine to Theodore Parker, together with other indigenous allies, such as the Free Religionists of Boston, who would demolish all existing creeds in order to rebuild some new religion on antichristian principles.

From the revealed side of the science, however, there have ensued occasional recoils against all rational religion. If it can be said that the disciples of natural theology and the followers of heathen religions have always been treated with due tolerance and pity, or that their own irreverence and folly have not often justified a harsh usage, yet it must also be granted that in the criticism of their systems many valuable grains of truth have been thrown away with the chaff of error, and that not seldom have the resorts of the defenders of Christian theology been found weak or absurd. Some of the Italian apologists were thus betrayed into an extravagant supernaturalism. Ficino and the two Picos, in opposing with Platonic arguments the Aristotelian doctrine of a mundane soul, maintained the direct intervention in the natural world not only of God but of spirits and angels, and thus opened the way for those superstitions of sacred magic and theosophy which soon overspread Europe.

Some of the English apologists, also, venturing upon the grounds of deism, were caught in serious errors. Cudworth, whose "Intellectual System of the Universe" remains a

prodigy of classical erudition and metaphysical acuteness, by reviving the ancient doctrine of a plastic nature or organizing soul distinct from God, avoided the fatalism of Hobbes only to become entangled in the scepticism of Bayle, who adroitly charged him with the very atheism he aimed to refute. Clarke, in his celebrated "Demonstration of the Being and Attributes of God," professed to frame a strictly logical conception of absolute deity, as a necessary substratum of infinite space and time; but by making human thought the measure of the divine nature, as well as by deriving from the world itself his proof of the divine character, he exposed himself to the sophistry of Bolingbroke, as expressed in the sarcasm of Pope against those

> "Who nobly take the high priori road
> And reason downwards till they doubt of God."

A number of apologists, such as Leland, seem to have consciously labored under social and literary disadvantages in criticising titled authors, like the Earl of Shaftesbury and Viscount Bolingbroke. Bishop Warburton's paradoxical defense of the Divine Legation of Moses on the ground that unlike heathen legislators he maintained a civil polity without the motives of future rewards and punishments, must have seemed to his astute opponents like the exploit of the dog in the fable, who sacrificed the substance for the shadow. And Bishop Berkeley, though his Principles of Human Knowledge are oftener ridiculed than refuted, can scarcely be said to have established Christian theism by assuming it as the basis of a metaphysical theory of the world, which Hume declared to have afforded more sceptical lessons than all ancient and modern systems combined.

Some of the French apologists, too, in their recoil from atheism ran into errors not less serious. Pascal, though he projected in his "Thoughts on Religion" a magnificent Christian apology, which is still admired as the torso of a master, might only have supported the orthodoxy of Augustine with the scepticism of Montaigne. Father Malebranche, whose theory of the vision of all things in God was tersely endorsed by Bossuet, *pulchra, nova, falsa*, seems to

have pursued his antagonist, Spinoza, along the dizzy verge of pantheism, until he became himself all but fascinated by the abyss from which he recoiled. And Fenelon, whilst discoursing with saintly eloquence upon a Deity conceived as the Being of all beings, the most Essential of all essences, may have only been neglecting plainer physical proofs which were destined to pass through the hands of Maupertuis, Bonnet, and Rousseau, until at length the Cardinal Polignac should find himself vainly confronting the "System of Nature," with his "Anti-Lucretius."

But some of the German apologists have recently been landed in still more deceptive errors. Since the time when Kant by his subtle criticism had undermined the theistic arguments of Leibnitz, Wolff, and their disciples, a host of defensive divines have been rushing into the breach armed with old and new weapons. The veteran theologians, Storr and Flatt, Knapp, Hengstenberg, and Tholuck, have simply striven to repel the new pantheism with the spontaneous evidence of reason, of conscience, and of Scripture. The Catholic Hettinger, in opposition to its chief authorities, has collated the testimonies of schoolmen, and doctors, and the decrees of councils. The Hegelian dogmatists, Marheineke, Daub, and Göschel, have been transfusing divine realities into its godless abstractions, and even looking for the Christian trinity in its trilogy of the universal logic. Other speculative divines have recoiled from it towards the crude Cartesian dualism, or the pre-established harmony of Leibnitz. At the same time, apologetic students of Comparative Theology, like the Platonizing fathers, are connecting the Christian religion as a supernatural and special revelation with one that is natural and universal in all other religions. And at length, as a fit counterpart for the wildest irreligion of infidel fancy, we have in our American medley of creeds, besides the new scriptures and apostles of Swedenborg and Irving, the modern Christianism of Campbell, and Judaism of Mormon.

In the great conflict which we have been sketching, Theology as the science of religion stands among the other sciences, like a citadel in the midst of concentric bulwarks, beleagured from outpost to battlement, but ever lifting a divine signal toward heaven.

At this point it would be in order to trace the same warfare in metaphysical science or rational cosmology, as waged by infidel pessimists from Voltaire to Schopenhauer and apologetic optimists from Leibnitz to Weygoldt; but the notice of these and other omitted opinions and authors must be reserved for the following chapters.

The Conflict in Philosophy.

Ascending at length into the high region of philosophy, the science of the sciences, we shall there find the conflict on the largest scale between the two great factions of infidel sceptics and apologetic mystics, who have contended, during successive centuries, in different countries, concerning the limits or prerogatives of reason and revelation, like rival emperors whose numerous skirmishes and battles at last merge in a general encounter for the prize of universal dominion.

At the rationalistic extreme of philosophy there has been a growing effort to supplant divine revelation by means of human reason. In the sixteenth century this effort was disguised and restricted. Italy, as we have seen, had the school of Pomponatius, whose treatise on Fate and Free Will was the first of the mock compromises between truths of reason and truths of revelation. France had but an occasional sceptic, such as Pierre Charron, a wayward disciple of Montaigne, who argued, in his work on "Wisdom," that revelation is metaphysically impossible, and reason, defective though it be, the only guide of life. And the rest of Europe was scarce disturbed with a doubt. In the seventeenth century the scene rather than the spirit of the movement was changed. Italy, for the time, disappeared from the philosophical arena. France was represented by Le Vayer, whose "Dialogues" united the scepticism of Charron with the epicurism of Gassendi, in a covert attack upon all revealed religion. And England was led into the coming conflict by Hobbes, who treated revelation as a mere historical tradition, to be woven into his system of political idolatry. In the eighteenth century the movement became more open and general. England now appeared in the front, under such leaders as Anthony Collins,

whose "Essay on Free Thinking" first asserted the independence of reason, whilst his "Grounds of the Christian Religion" undermined the prophetical evidence of revelation; Wollaston, whose "Discourses" assailed the miraculous evidence as of a purely mythical nature; and Morgan, whose "Moral Philosopher" made reason the sole judge of the contents as well as evidences of revelation, rejecting Christianity as mere sublimated Judaism. France soon followed with such master spirits as Voltaire and Rousseau in the world of letters, D'Alembert and Diderot in the world of science, and D'Holbach and Helvetius in the world of fashion, all combining to array reason against revelation, with a versatile genius as dazzling as the hues of the serpent in paradise. Germany, too, at the infidel court of Frederick and in the "Wolfenbüttel Fragments" of Reimarus, began to muster for the formidable critical attack of the next century. And Europe generally was asserting the independence of reason against revelation; whilst America first emerged to view in the "Age of Reason," by the notorious Tom Paine. And now, in this nineteenth century, we behold the movement everywhere becoming intense and systematic. France has condensed all her materialistic infidelity in Auguste Comte, whose "Positive Philosophy" aims to substitute physical science by the very law of its growth, in place of revelation. Germany has massed all her erudite, metaphysical infidelity, in David Strauss, whose "Life of Christ" is an astute attempt to resolve the gospels into mere ancient myths and philosophic fables, in the light of modern thought and research. England has reproduced all her varied practical infidelity in Francis Newman, whose "Phases of Faith" exhibit the transition of Christianity, from Calvinism to Deism, under a supposed law of progress, toward a perfect religion. And America would seem to have combined English, French and German infidelity in Theodore Parker, whose "Discourses of Religion" represent the Christian revelation as only the last of the world's mythologies, to be surmounted by the one absolute faith of reason.

At the mystical extreme of philosophy there has been a corresponding effort meanwhile to supplant human reason by

means of divine revelation. In the sixteenth century this effort was complete and successful. Italy, as we have seen, had the Platonic school of the two Picos, whose works on the "Heptaplus" or six days' creation, and the "Study of Divine and Human Wisdom," virtually superseded reason, by deriving from revelation all science, both physical and metaphysical, heathen and Christian. Germany had the affiliated schools of Reuchlin, whose "Wonderful Word" offered the Holy Scriptures as the only cure of monkish ignorance, and the key to all knowledge, divine and human; Agrippa, whose "Occult Philosophy" proposed divine revelation as the sole remedy for the uncertainty and vanity of human science; and Valentine Weigel, whose "Golden Touchstone, or Way to learn Infallibly All Things," afterward gave rise to the extravagant pretensions of the Rosicrucians, or secret fraternity of the Rosy Cross. England, at the same time, had the forerunner of a like movement in Robert Fludd, whose "Mosaic Philosophy" professed to found a purely Christian science of creation on the book of Genesis. And Europe at large was only beginning to waken from the trance of scholastic mysticism. In the seventeenth century, with the increase of free thought, the effort grew more conscious and avowed. Italy was then under the heel of the Roman hierarchy, claiming to suppress reason by an infallible revelation, as expressed in the decrees of the Council of Trent. Germany still retained her school of mystic naturalists and divines, such as the Van Helmonts, father and son, whose "Holy Art" was designed to substitute revelation and inspiration for reason and observation in all fields of research; Jacob Bœhme, the Teutonic Philosopher, who sought, by his "Aurora," to shed the light of Scripture through every province of nature; and John Comenius, who professed to derive from the Mosaic writings a "Synopsis of Physics, reformed according to Divine Light." France had a convert to the same school, in Pierre Poiret, who assailed Descartes and Locke as mere rationalists; distinguishing, in his "Three Kinds of Learning," all human science from the Divine wisdom, as in its very nature false or superficial. Sweden, Norway and Switzerland had like representatives in such biblical philosophers as Casman, whose

"Modest Assertion of True and Christian Philosophy" embraced a whole encyclopædia of science, derived exclusively from the Scriptures; Aslach, who drew from the same source, "A System of Christian Ethics and Physics;" and Daneau at Geneva, who wrote a similar treatise on "Christian Ethics." England, at the same time, rallied against her deistical rationalists, the Cambridge school of Platonic divines, such as Theophilus Gale, the learned Presbyterian non-conformist, whose "Court of the Gentiles" was designed to include all human philosophy within the pale of divine revelation, by heathen tradition from the Holy Scriptures and the Jewish Church; Henry More, the ascetic mystic, of whom we have before spoken, whose "Cabalistic Conjectures" proceeded upon the same theory, only to a greater extreme; and the naturalists, Hutchinson, Burnet and Whiston, who endeavored to extract whole systems of physical science from the books of Moses. And Europe generally was marshalled for the great impending conflict. In the eighteenth century, with a change of ground and weapons, the effort became defensive and desperate. Italy still claimed the whole province of philosophy for the chair of St. Peter. England, forced to concede to reason her rights as critic of the evidences of revelation, produced only such judicious apologies as those of Butler, Warburton and Paley. France, overwhelmed with revolutionary infidelity, presented no longer any front of aggressive Christianity. Germany was idly striving to make terms with the rationalism which spread stealthily through her seats of culture. And all Christendom was a theatre of conflicting opinions. At length, in this nineteenth century, the effort would seem to have wholly ceased or become purely apologetic. Protestantism, rallying round an infallible Bible, has left the open field to reason, whilst Catholicism alone pretends to repress and confine it through her recent syllabus of an infallible Pope.

And thus philosophy, in such extreme hands, has threatened, by turns, to exterminate reason through a tyrannical abuse of revelation, or to supersede revelation through an impious usurpation of reason.

The Results in Civilization.

Descending now to the plane of common life, where theories are reduced to practice and ideas issue in events, we shall there behold the great speculative conflict attended with corresponding convulsions and disasters, in different countries, through successive generations, like the havoc and misery which mark the track of contending armies.

At the one extreme, by an infidel philosophy, civilization has repeatedly been forced into collision with Christianity. Italian infidelity in the sixteenth century, basking at the very court of the Holy Father, fostered immorality, tyranny, and impiety in the clergy, whilst it practised astrology, magic, and quackery upon the people, until public indignation forced it to assume the garb of virtue. English infidelity in the seventeenth century, flushed with its victory over puritanism at the court of Charles the Second, made religion the jest of the aristocracy, leavened the Church with hypocrisy, and, though repudiated by the nation, corrupted, through its literature, the faith of other lands for generations. French infidelity in the eighteenth century, breaking forth in the revolutionary convention, decreed the abolition of worship and the priesthood, converted the churches into temples of reason, inscribed over the cemeteries, "Death is an eternal sleep," and reigned amid orgies of blood and terror which sent a shudder throughout Christendom. German infidelity in the nineteenth century, bursting through the jargon of philosophy, proclaimed undisguisedly the reign of lust, the worship of self, the downfall of the Church, and at length, from the National Assembly itself, threatened an anarchy which the moral earnestness of the people alone averted. And American infidelity in our own day, by its bold attacks upon Christian institutions in the form of free love, necromancy and anarchy, is already, ever and anon, menacing the social order.

At the other extreme, however, by a fanatical faith Christianity has repeatedly been forced into collision with civilization. It was Italian fanaticism which, from the tribunal of the Inquisition, consigned the first martyrs of philosophy to the dungeon and the flames, inscribed each new discovery of sci-

ence in the index of heresies, kindled the fagot of religious persecution, and convulsed Europe with the desolating wars of the Reformation. It was French fanaticism which, by the decrees of the Sorbonne, arrayed learning for the time on the side of superstition, destroyed or expelled the soundest culture of the nation by the massacre of St. Bartholomew, fostered hypocrisy, corruption, and tyranny in the court and aristocracy, and thus, in the issue, provoked the horrors of the Revolution. It was English fanaticism which, through the successive wars of episcopacy, presbytery and independency, subverted the entire social fabric of Great Britain, and at length achieved, in the Act of Uniformity, that political massacre of dissent, whose ghost now comes back in the shape of disestablishment. If German fanaticism has appeared only in such exceptional disorders as those of the Anabaptists and other later sectaries, it may be because the conservative and speculative habit of the people but seldom precipitates it into action. And what American fanaticism can accomplish has already been shown in the convulsions connected with slavery, polygamy, and the panics of the Second Adventists.

Thus the extremists, on both sides, reach a like degree of divergence and opposition, and in their aims or tendencies are both destructive. Were either to prevail against the other, an original power of human nature would be annulled, and a vast accumulation of human knowledge dispersed. The real issue made by them, however unwittingly, is whether science shall extirpate religion, or religion shall extirpate science; or, stated more practically, whether civilization shall reduce Christianity to superstition, or Christianity remand civilization to barbarism.

Now, although such extreme errors are by no means equally pernicious, yet they plainly both proceed upon the same false view of the normal relations of reason and revelation. There is nothing in the idea of either to necessitate collision or conflict. Viewed in the abstract, the finite mind and the Infinite Mind, the divine intelligence and the human intelligence, cannot be presumed to be in a state of logical opposition. Each may have its own distinct sphere, method, and aim; and, at the same time, safely concede the like to the other. To put

them at war, would be only to force them into abnormal action. It may be taken as an axiom, that it is at once contrary to reason to oppose revelation, and contrary to revelation to oppose reason. So that, when any antagonism springs up between them, it is simply to be treated as anomalous.

In the first place, it is apparent rather than real. Often it consists of mere logomachy, which would disappear on a close comparison of terms and views. Religious creeds and scientific theories come into conflict, not because of any actual disagreement between the facts of nature and the truths of Scripture, but solely because of some false exegesis on the one side, or some wrong induction on the other. All truth must be found consistent with itself, when freed from admixture with error.

In the second place, it is temporary rather than permanent. The least developed sciences are those which are in this stage of antagonism, while the most exact and complete are already passing into one of lasting harmony. As our science and our theology mature, they will correct and complement each other, until at length they shall stand forth coincident. The unity of knowledge is as axiomatic as the unity of truth.

In the third place, it is in some of its effects, salutary rather than hurtful. By means of it, the several growths of reason and revelation in history have been disentangled, and left to a freer and more fruitful development. Science has been emancipated from ecclesiastical domination and fanatical interference, and religion from unsafe alliances with bigotry and superstition; while in both departments new enthusiasms have been kindled and a minuter division of labors promoted.

We conclude, therefore, that the two interests, whatever else they may be, are not hostile and exterminant, but distinct and separate, limiting each other with boundaries which neither can pass except at its own peril. Let the religionist who would invade science be warned by that saying of a Christian sage, "If you will try to chop iron, the axe becomes unable to cut even wood;" and let the scientist who would invade religion be warned by that heathen fable, wherein "men and gods are represented as unable to draw Jupiter to earth, but Jupiter able to draw them up to heaven."

CHAPTER III.

MODERN INDIFFERENTISM BETWEEN SCIENCE AND RELIGION.

If a truce should be proclaimed between two great armies on the brink of battle, we can imagine what a change would pass over the spectacle; how the advancing squadrons would everywhere be recalled, the noise and dust of the conflict cease, and the long, serried ranks rest upon their arms, whilst ambassadors from both sides, in high council, were exchanging hollow forms of peace amid the stern realities of war. It might even seem for a little space as if some terms were to be arranged, giving divided empire to both sovereigns, until suddenly the signal of renewed hostilities would dispel the dream and show it to have been but like the portentous lull before a storm.

"And so," says the Duke of Argyll, "we see the men of Theology coming out to parley with the men of Science,—a white flag in their hands, and saying, 'If you will let us alone, we will do the same by you. Keep to your province, do not enter ours. The Reign of Law which you proclaim we admit—outside these walls, but not within them. Let there be peace between us.' But this will never do. There can be no such treaty dividing the domain of truth."

We have termed this class of thinkers, whether they are in the interest of religion or of science, the Indifferentists, because they would seclude themselves from each other in a strict indifference; the one, by holding to revelation without reason, and the other, by holding to reason without revela-

tion. They stand aloof from every question into which Scripture and Science can enter. In mutual dread of invasion, they seem to have agreed upon a division and joint occupancy of the domain of truth, while as to any common ground between them, they will keep up a kind of armed neutrality or truce, until either shall have demonstrated his power to take and hold it in defiance of the other. In a word, they are the men who cry, Peace, when there is no peace in all the wide field of philosophy.

As compared with the party of Extremists already noticed, they are only less averse to any proper settlement of the question before us. At heart they may in fact cherish the same mutual hostility; but from a dislike of controversy, or from a disingenuous habit of reserve, or from a temper of compromising, or from a staid, conservative spirit, or from some narrowness of mental view, they fail to see both sides of the question at once, and utterly neglect the one interest in their exclusive pursuit of the other. Let us, however, sketch them separately before we proceed to estimate their common errors.

On the one side, we find the indifferent religionist or religious indifferentist, who does not invade, but simply ignores the province of science. In his view, the facts of Nature have nothing to do with the truths of Scripture, and are to be treated as absolutely irrelevant. When any scientific theory runs counter to his exegesis, he is at no pains to inquire into the relative credibility and value of either; and should any scientific discovery shed new illustration upon a revealed doctrine, he shuns it as a questionable admixture of sacred with secular or profane learning. He still clings to the interpretations of a former and darker age, in the face of modern research, and refuses either to correct or improve them. Theology, the true mother of the sciences, is turned by him into a monster, who spurns them away even when they come with joined hands to kneel at her feet.

On the other side, we find the indifferent scientist or scientific indifferentist, who does not invade, but simply ignores the province of religion. Its mysteries are, in his eyes, too transcendental and vague to be included in exact inquiries.

Should his theories run against any reigning doctrine or interpretation of Scripture, he is in no wise troubled at the discrepancy; or should they seem to require any of its ideas and records for their own rational support, he almost scorns them as unscientific and prejudicial. Even his vocabulary has become more Pagan than Christian. His God is but the abstraction of a Great First Cause, or a personification called Nature; all divine manifestations and purposes are, in his view, mere phenomena, with their causes and laws; creation, as a whole, is but a cosmos or system without an intelligent Author, or an intelligible object, to give it consistency and grandeur. Science, torn by him from that theology which nurtured her, is left to wander as an orphaned vagabond in the universe.

If we seek the historical beginnings of such indifferentism, in either of its forms, we shall find them wherever the love of a theory or of a creed has proved stronger than the love of truth. It was somewhat of this spirit, under its scientific phase, which led the early Greek sophists, whilst observing outward respect for the reigning mythology, to corrupt the faith of the Athenian youth, like certain savants in our day, by adroit word-tricks and a specious show of little knowledge. It was somewhat of this spirit, under its religious phase, which prompted the early Latin fathers, whilst appreciating pagan learning, to resist its introduction into the Church, like certain divines of our time, from a well-meant fear that it might sophisticate the clergy or the people. And even among the later Latin schoolmen, when the scholastic phrenzy was at its height, there were not wanting instances, here and there, of an ironical skepticism or of an ascetic pietism, which were but masked forms of the same spirit. But it was not until the Reformation had been driven to the opposite extremes, described in the last chapter, that a recoil ensued towards that mutual indifference, that studied avoidance, which has taken the place of the open conflicts of past generations. It was after modern sectarianism had issued in a medley of creeds and churches, that many scientists became latitudinarian upon religious questions; and it was after modern infidelity had made disastrous inroads upon orthodoxy, that many reli-

gionists grew distrustful of scientific researches. And now at length we behold, as the two resulting and most conspicuous phases of current thought, on the one side, an imposing sciolism, which would politely bow all religion out of science, and on the other side, a lofty dogmatism, which would austerely frown all science out of religion.

Before we proceed to give some examples of this indifferent spirit, it should be observed that the terms sciolists and dogmatists are used only to denote such scientists as avowedly ignore all religious truths, and such religionists as consciously exclude all scientific facts, rather than those whose mutual indifference may simply be due to absorption in their special pursuits, or to a natural desire to protect them from unphilosophical intrusion and interference.

Reviewing first the physical sciences, we shall there find that amid the border warfare of infidels and apologists during the last three centuries, the great body of the scientific specialists and professional divines have secluded themselves in their own provinces, where they have been fain to construct separate systems of truth, until by gradual avoidance in each natural science, they dwell apart as mere sciolists and dogmatists, like neighboring potentates, whose former raids and forays have died into an armed frontier.

The Schism in Astronomy.

In astronomy, for example, the two antagonists have long since separated, by divergent steps, into a fixed indifference.

On the rational side of the science, attempts have been made openly to repudiate the whole biblical astronomy as no longer of any scientific authority or philosophical value. Whilst some astronomers may have ignored Scripture doctrines simply from philosophical prudence and taste, others have rejected them as rational postulates, or even as related truths essential to a complete theory of the heavens. La Place himself, it will be remembered, could distinctly avow that in his "System of the World" he had no need for the hypothesis of a God. Alexander Humboldt, it could not fail to be remarked, has sketched a "Cosmos" in which the name of God is not to be found, concluding his sublime picture of the

heavens and earth with no higher hope than that it may promote a more animated recognition of the universe as a whole. Mr. Herbert Spencer, in an essay on the Nebular Hypothesis, whilst claiming that it renders the heavens and earth perfectly comprehensible, insists that their origin is absolutely inconceivable, with no more allusion to the first verse of Genesis than if it had never been written. Professor Lovering declared, from the chair of the American Scientific Association, that in his view, astronomy has no more to do with theology than with jurisprudence. Professor Tyndall, who occasionally quotes Scripture in his scientific speculations, in an essay on "Matter and Force," asserts that the question of Napoleon to a knot of infidel savants, "Who made the heavens?" must remain unanswered. And Doctor Maudsley, with still less reserve, in his recent article on the "Limits of Philosophical Inquiry," at the close of an eloquent description of the insignificance of man in comparison with the sidereal universe, wonders, in the very language of the Psalmist, that he should presume to affirm whose glory the heavens declare, whose handiwork the firmament showeth.

On the revealed side of the same science, in like manner, the whole scientific astronomy is openly repudiated as of no scriptural warrant or even dogmatic interest. Whilst some well-informed divines may exclude astronomical conceptions, under a feeling of theological or clerical propriety, others either assume frankly that the Chaldaic or Ptolemaic system is Scriptural, or deny that the Copernican system is essential to a complete doctrine of the heavens. Cardinal Baronius thus met the new astronomy of Galileo with the extraordinary statement that it was the intention of Holy Scripture to teach how to go to heaven, and not how heaven goes. Calvin also, as an avowed Ptolemaist, only enunciated the narrow geocentric principle upon which many modern interpreters still proceed, when he insisted that Moses, speaking by the Holy Spirit, did not treat of the heavenly luminaries as an astronomer, but as it became a theologian, having regard to us rather than to the stars. The elder Rosenmüller, in his "Most Ancient History of the Earth," declared it an absurdity to require that inspired prophets should have spoken in

accordance with the philosophy of Newton. Knapp, in his "Christian Theology," maintains that the Mosaic history of creation can neither be made to confirm nor to contradict the systems of Descartes, Buffon and Bergmann, and that every attempt to draw arguments from it either for or against any of them, is but labor thrown away. Professor Tayler Lewis, annotating Lange's Commentary, suggests that the tendency to treat the Bible heavens as the astronomical heavens, attributes to Moses too much science, or makes him a mere automatic medium of inspiration. Dr. Murphy, of Belfast, in his "Genesis," whilst admitting the wonderful astronomy of the modern and western nations, insists that the only cosmos of which Moses was inspired to speak was the sky and land of eastern Asia, as adapted to the little Jewish theocracy which was there to be founded. And acting upon these principles, without avowing them, great biblical scholars such as Hengstenberg, Tholuck and Alexander, living amidst the magnificent celestial discoveries of Herschel, Bessel and Arago, have descanted upon the astronomical psalms in the spirit of an ancient Hebrew peasant, as if the heavens declared no other glory than a spangled vault, and the firmament showed no higher handiwork than a gorgeous canopy.

And thus astronomy, under the indifferent spirit, instead of soaring toward God through the highest heavens, would either grovel beneath the narrow sky of our earth with Chaldean seers and Jewish rabbins, or grope after heathen sages among the fortuitous atoms of Epicurus into the godless void of Lucretius.

The Schism in Geology.

In geology, likewise, a similar separation of rational and revealed truth has proceeded on both sides to a schismatic extreme.

On the rational side of the science, are those who would hastily repudiate the whole biblical geology as no longer of any scientific worth or relevance. It was not strange that some of the early geologists who were of a devout temper, such as Leibnitz and Hooke, should be reluctant to press theories which were plainly inconsistent with received interpretations of Genesis; or that others of them, who were simply

animated with scientific zeal, such as Vallisnieri and Hutton, should insist upon a fair field for their investigations, by excluding manufactured miracles and catastrophies, and referring all terrestrial phenomena, as far as possible, to known natural laws and causes now existing, without raising speculative questions as to the origin and destiny of the globe. But there remains another class, of very different spirit, who deny that the revealed cosmogony is even logically or philosophically essential to a complete theory of the earth, and have banished it from their speculations, only themselves to illustrate anew the mundane egg in the comedy of Aristophanes. Baron Humboldt, whilst congratulating geologists that their science, on the continent at least, has been emancipated from Semitic influences, nevertheless himself essayed the problem of the world-upholding tortoise by proposing to poise a liquid globe of fire in a thin shell of granite, too impossible, as Lyell argues, to have existed even for an instant. Sir Charles Lyell himself, who always treats the Scriptures with respect, indicates his sense of their scientific value by studiously excluding them from his "Principles of Geology," even from his learned chapter on oriental cosmogony, whilst the sacred books of the Hindoos are discussed and commended as of peculiar interest to the geologist, as well as full of sublime conceptions of the Deity. "But you are not therefore to think," says the Lysicles of Berkeley, "that Alciphron pays any more real regard to the authority of such apocryphal writers, or believes one syllable of the Chinese, Babylonian or Egyptian traditions. If he seem to give them a preference before the Bible, it is only because they are not established by law." Prof. Max Müller, with the extreme of scientific candor, remarks in his "Chips from a German Workshop," that he would hail with equal pleasure any solid facts by which to establish the dependence of Genesis on the Zend-Avesta, or the dependence of the Zend-Avesta on Genesis. Professor Huxley, in an essay on "Geological Reform," so far from admitting with Lyell that the origin and destiny of the globe are questions to be settled only by the Infinite Mind, maintains that we are as competent to trace the genesis of a world as the growth of a fowl within the egg. And Mr. Herbert Spencer, throwing off all reserve,

after having shown how the embryo earth was formed, according to the nebular hypothesis, out of a fiery nucleus into its present shape and condition, declares that if one of our leading geologists were asked whether he believes in the Biblical Genesis, he would take the question as next to an insult.

On the revealed side of the science, meanwhile, in the same thoughtless manner, the whole scientific geology is sometimes rejected as without Scriptural warrant or doctrinal interest. It was not surprising that judicious divines, such as Gennarelli and Stillingfleet, should have hesitated to incorporate with Genesis the grotesque hypotheses which marked the credulous infancy of the science; or that others should have insisted upon the grammatical and dogmatic sense, against the many pretended scientific interpretations which were merely of a speculative nature. But a class has since arisen, of less genial spirit, who would exclude the true geology, as well as the false, from the Scriptures and retain a doctrine of the earth avowedly at variance with its known physical development and structure. Dr. Chalmers himself, assuming that Genesis was not a complete history of creation, suggested that many irrelevant geological chapters might have been omitted between the first and second verses, in consistency with its general design as a revelation to the Jewish and Christian world. Dean Buckland, in his Bridgewater Treatise, on the same theory of partial reserve, trenchantly asks of those persons who consider physical science a fit subject of revelation, what point they can imagine short of a communication of Omniscience, at which such a revelation might have stopped without imperfections of omission, whether at the epoch of Ptolemy or Copernicus or Newton. Archbishop Sumner, in his "Records of Creation," maintains that the expressions of Moses are evidently accommodated to the first and familiar appearances derived from the sensible phenomena of the earth and heavens. Archdeacon Pratt of Calcutta, in his "Scripture and Science not at Variance," though holding himself ready for a scientific explanation, should it come, somewhat incautiously prejudges that Scripture was not designed to teach us natural philosophy, and that it is in vain to attempt to make a cosmogony out of its statements. The Rev. W. D. Cony-

beare, in his "Geology of England and Wales," having boldly premised the principle, that we should first determine what ought reasonably to be expected in Genesis, announced that the connection of geology will be with natural rather than revealed religion. For such reasons the Edinburgh Review, noticing the Mosaic cosmogonies of the day, expressed it as a general opinion, that it would be better to leave altogether untouched the connection of geology with the sacred narrative. And learned divines and commentators, such as Knapp, Gerlach and Keil, living amid the grand geological discoveries of Cuvier, Lyell and Von Buch, have descanted upon the six days in which God made heaven and earth and all that in them is, as if they were mere dramatic pictures or magical fiats, distributed literally through the working hours of a week, and designed mainly to enforce the proper observance of the Sabbath.

And thus geology, the science which embraces the origin and destiny of the globe we inhabit, if governed by the indifferent spirit, instead of retracing the Creator through all His works, would be remanded either toward the Jewish cabala and the Patristic allegories, or toward the heathen cosmogonies of the Hindoo and the Greek.

The Schism in Anthropology.

In anthropology a similar truce has already been proclaimed and is fast growing into a rupture. On the rational side of the science, by some leading naturalists, the whole biblical anthropology or revealed doctrine of mankind is either ignored or repudiated as of no scientific import or even philosophical interest The earlier naturalists who professed theism, such as Lamarck and the author of the "Vestiges," were not inclined to question the scripture doctrine of the First Adam, and others, who were of a more sceptical turn, such as De Maillet and Monboddo, simply observed a tone of irony and raillery which could not be charged with irreligion. But later, more advanced disciples of the school are now beginning seriously to treat the origin of man as a mere zoölogical question, and to accept openly the most unscriptural consequences of their speculations. Lyell, indeed, has discussed the antiquity of

man through an elaborate treatise, as if he had never heard of the book of Genesis, unless he refers to it by his suggestion, that at some remote period the whole space between the highest animal and the lowest human races may have been cleared at a bound by one start of formative nature, and the salient epoch appear no more miraculous, after all the mists of mythologic fiction shall have been dissipated by historical criticism, than the birth of an extraordinary genius from rude parents. Mr. Darwin, manifesting a similar reserve as to the Scriptures, maintains that there is no evidence that man was aboriginally endowed with belief in a God; and declares with intrepid candor and consistency that he would rather be descended from the heroic little monkey who braved death in defence of his keeper, or the brave old baboon who rescued his comrade from a crowd of dogs, than from a savage who practices cannibalism and sorcery. In the same spirit Professor Rogers, as President of the American Scientific Association, has lately maintained that the cruelties practised by the lower races, and the outrages attributed to total depravity among civilized men, are but the outbursts of a savage nature, inherited from their animal progenitors. Dr. Charles Hodge complains of the chief archæologists of the day, that they seem to have discarded the Biblical history, only themselves to build up enormous chronologies upon evidence which would not determine an intelligent jury in a suit for thirty shillings, and though unable to trace any design in the eye or the hand, can find enough in a flint-chip or bone implement to indicate a whole pre-historic epoch. Dr. Asa Gray admits, while he deplores, the tendency of the average scientific mind, as soon as it finds out how anything is done in nature, to conclude that God did not do it, and can only look forward to some better time when the religious faith which survived the notion of the fixity of the earth, may equally outlast the notion of the fixity of the species which inhabit it. And Professor J. P. Lesley, as if speaking for his whole order, in his treatise on "Man's Position and Destiny viewed from the Platform of the Sciences," declares of the statements in Genesis, that men of science now treat them as old Jewish legends, and, indeed, have become so indifferent to them, that it is not worth while to try to show their absurdity.

On the revealed side of the same science, however, we may find advocates of an exclusively Biblical or dogmatic anthropology, who would deliberately shut their eyes to all the discoveries of ethnologists, linguists and antiquarians, as having no bearing whatever upon either the veracity of Scripture or the true, complete doctrine of mankind. A former school of divines, like Stanhope Smith and Bachman, could contribute scientific memoirs and treatises upon the human species without fear of imperiling any sacred interest; and devout laymen of the same school did not scruple to include among their authorities the Hindoo Shaster and the Chinese Shoo-king as at least corroborative of the Hebrew Scriptures, nor hesitate to link the unbroken traditions of the great religious races of Asia and Europe with the scattered legends of savage tribes in America and Polynesia. But another and very different class, in our day, seem bent upon resisting all the light which the new anthropological researches can shed upon the meaning of Genesis, and are still urging the old, crude interpretation in the face of the most earnest protests. Principal Dawson, in his "Story of Earth and Man," gives his opinion that the evolutionism which professes to have a Creator somewhere behind it is practically atheistic and, if possible, more unphilosophical than that which professes to set out from self-existing star-dust, containing all the possibilities of the universe. Dr. Gray warns such apologists that, for the defence of a mere untenable outpost, they are firing away in their catapults the very bastions of the citadel, and deprecates their unwise attempt to force devout naturalists into the ranks of Büchner and Vogt. Dr. Hodge, in a recent able treatise, defines Darwinism as Atheism; makes it incompatible with the orthodoxy of Mivart, Henslow, McCosh and Brown; and also depreciates the classical illustration by which Paley sought to prove a creative design in the animal species. The Rev. Walter Mitchell, from the chair of the Victoria Institute, as if speaking for the Christian scientists of England, declares that Darwinism is an attempt to push the Creator farther back out of view and dethrone God, and that the creation and maintenance of species within impassable barriers is the true teaching of Genesis and the

only scientific theory. Such hasty prejudgment has been especially shown in reference to the question of the origin of the human species. Dr. Keil, in his Genesis, would deny that such a question falls within the province of inductive science, and has described the organization of Adam out of the ground and his animation with a soul, as an instantaneous miracle, wrought by an omnipotent fiat, without connection with any previous process or product of creation. Dr. Kurtz, though he admits that all the powers of nature conspired with the Spirit of God in the formation of man, denies that there could have been any time or succession in the process, as it would be derogatory to imagine him in the animal stage even for a moment. And other learned divines and commentators, living at a time when anthropologists on all sides are unearthing the fossil flora and fauna coeval with primitive man, seem to find nothing more in the sixth day of Genesis than a confused succession of monster creations, enormous fishes, reptiles and mammals, following each other in a few hours, and serving only as a prelude to the doctrine of Adam's fall.

And thus anthropology, the science which includes the origin and destiny of our species, if dismembered by the indifferent spirit, would but retrace the frescoes of Raphael and the paradise of Milton, or revive the sphinxes of Hesiod and the centaurs of Virgil.

Passing next into the psychical sciences, we shall there, in like manner, discover the sciolists and dogmatists gradually entrenching themselves during the last three centuries in opposite systems of thought and faith, which have stood, amid the clouds of speculation, like lofty feudal castles, frowning defiance across a contested border.

If the gulf, which has been yawning between the biblical and scientific sections of these sciences, has not yet become as obvious and familiar as that which we have traced in the other sciences, yet it will seem none the less frightful to those who can discern it, but rather the more so, when it is found that scientific hypotheses are apparently excluding religious dogmas from domains of research, which have long been claimed as the sole province of revelation.

The Schism in Psychology.

In psychology the two antagonists have steadily been settling into a divided empire.

On the rational side we seem to have reached a stage of indifference in which the whole biblical psychology is to be set aside as of no scientific authority or philosophical value. The forerunners of the science, like Descartes and Hartley, strove to find a Scriptural warrant for their spiritualistic or materialistic speculations, and some of the recent leaders of the science, like Carpenter and Lotze, do not deny the province of revelation in regard to many psychological questions. But a school is now emerging, composed partly of professed psychologists, but mainly of amateur recruits from other sciences, who either ignore the whole Scripture doctrine of the soul or would erect their own crude hypotheses in its stead. Professor Bain of Aberdeen has written elaborate volumes on "The Senses, the Emotions and the Will," in which he has perfectly succeeded in excluding all direct allusions of a biblical or even religious nature. Dr. Maudsley, who can quote Scripture for a purpose in his acute treatises, refers the origin of mind or mental force to the inscrutable Power which impels evolution throughout nature, and admits a miraculous revelation from that Power to be conceivable, but evidently does not look for any light from such a quarter, upon the otherwise insoluble problems of psychology. Dr. Bence Jones, in his "Croonian Lectures on Matter and Force," has explicitly affirmed that the Biblical account of the constitution of man is not to be allowed any scientific authority whatever. Professor Tyndall, in his famous Belfast address, would seem inclined to make Bishop Butler as non-committal as himself in regard to the whole nature, origin and destiny of the soul; but the chapter cited is a masterly argument for our immortality, from spiritualistic as well as materialistic premises, and the rest of the treatise is a hitherto unanswered course of strictly scientific reasoning in favor of divine revelation as a supernatural source of knowledge in the whole region of psychical inquiry. Professor Huxley also, in several scientific papers, has exhibited the automatism of Descartes as derived

from his Scriptural spiritualism, and the determinism of Edwards as severed from his Biblical theism; and consistently with his own scientific creed, he has protested that if some great Power would agree to make him always think what is true and do what is right, on condition of being turned into a sort of clock and wound up every morning before he got out of bed, he would instantly close with the offer. And John Stuart Mill may be said to have pushed such schismatic psychology into the practical sphere when, in his treatise on "Liberty," he ranked the Meditations of Antoninus with the Beatitudes of Christ, and declared his belief that other ethics than any which can be evolved from distinctively Christian sources, must exist side by side with the Christian ethics, to produce the moral regeneration of mankind.

At the same time, however, on the revealed side, we behold a biblical psychology, which seeks to detach itself wholly from all the discoveries and theories of mental science and repudiate them as of no doctrinal interest or didactic value. Many intelligent divines, it is true, cannot but perceive its preliminary and fundamental importance. The most representative divine of the age, Dr. Hodge, in the anthropological part of his Systematic Theology, distinctly admits that every theologian must include in his system some theory of the will, as predetermining his theology and measurably his religion; and he has himself endeavored to converge all the light of modern psychology and physiology upon the dogmas of regeneration and resurrection. Others, however, would seem to have tacitly assumed the psychological theories, traditionally involved in their creed or church confession, as being of Scriptural origin, though not revealed with metaphysical exactness, very much as the Ptolemaic astronomy was once identified with orthodoxy, and consequently ignore any more recent results of mental science inconsistent with them. But still others, who accept such results, make no use of them in defending and illustrating the true psychology of the Scriptures. Though St. Paul referred depravity to the perverted action of mental laws and described the resurrection as a natural metamorphosis, and though the Scriptures everywhere, by precept and example, enforce all the humane

virtues, as well as godly graces, which should have place in the true Christian ethics, yet they treat the various mental and moral sciences as mere branches of secular or profane learning; and at a time when the non-christian votaries of these sciences are quoting Scripture as often as it can serve their own purpose and masquerading in the very garb of orthodoxy, they continue to represent the peculiar doctrines of grace as but so many abnormal miracles or anomalous mysteries, intended for the trial of our faith.

And thus psychology, the science of the noblest part of our nature, if it is to be torn asunder by the indifferent spirit, instead of transfiguring both body and soul, would but blend the crass materialism of Tertullian with the ascetic spiritualism of Pascal, or abandon us to the morals of Seneca and the fate of Lucretius.

The Schism in Sociology.

In sociology, also, the two antagonists have been fast verging into a sort of permanent armistice.

On the rational side of the science we may find some advanced sociologists entering that stage of complete indifference, where the whole biblical sociology, the doctrines of Providence, of the Church and of the millenium, are to be abandoned as of no scientific authority or value. Whilst great civilians, historians and philanthropists have claimed their hypotheses concerning the origin, course and destiny of society to be compatible with the teachings of Scripture, or have ignored such teachings simply from philosophical taste or prudence, a wing of the modern school is striving to exclude them as wholly unscientific, and even as obstructive to the true science of humanity. Comte, as the declared founder of sociology, maintained that until his day it had lingered in the theological or superstitious stage of scientific development, hampered by the notion of a Providence, very much as astronomy had been retarded by mythical archangels, and chemistry bewitched by infinitesimal spirits. Mr. J. S. Mill, defining the terms of the new science, adopted Comte's law of the universal evolution of humanity, but without even stating the central problems of sacred history and

prophecy. The late Mr. Buckle introduced his history of civilization with a discussion of the dogmas of free-will and predestination, or supernatural interference, as having been, hitherto, the chief impediments to the formation of a historical science. Dr. Draper has claimed that his laws of development are compatible with individual free-will, and occasionally recognizes the fact of a Supreme Being, though without discussing the corresponding question of His relation to such laws in history. But Mr. Spencer, as unable to conceive of a Providence as of a Creation, lays it down as a preliminary principle, that for those who entertain that conception, there can be no such thing as sociology, properly so called.

On the revealed side, however, still remain leading church historians in that stage of indifference where social science and civil history have been virtually repudiated as unchurchly and unchristian, and attempts are made to construct an exclusively biblical doctrine of society. While some large-hearted and far-seeing divines, such as Neander and Fisher, have perceived the vital connection of civilization with Christianity in history; and others, such as Arnold and Rothe, have looked forward to their consummate union in an ideal Christian state; yet these have been too exceptional to form a great guiding class, and as yet could do little more than admit and lament the narrow unhistorical spirit which characterizes the body of modern ecclesiastical learning. Dr. John Henry Newman, before he had the zeal of a convert to Catholicism, declared, in his Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine, that the only English writer, who had any claims to be considered an ecclesiastical historian, was the infidel Gibbon, and that the popular religion seems scarcely to recognize the twelve ages between the Councils of Nicæa and Trent, except as illustrating Protestant interpretations of certain prophecies of St. Peter and St. Paul. Dr. J. Addison Alexander, in an article on the History of Doctrines, dwells upon an unhistorical peculiarity of the American mind, which leads it to the perpetual resuscitation of exploded absurdities and renewal of attempts long since proved abortive, and has forced religion into a false position in reference to the important interests of science, art and civil government. The late Stephen Colwell

was so convinced of this divorce of the Church from all modern social science, that he published as new themes: "Creeds without Charity, Theology without Humanity, and Protestantism without Christianity."

The same spirit of unphilosophical dogmatism lingers in the older, more historical nations. The reactionary Catholic school in France simply repudiates the abounding socialistic speculations of the age as the mere froth of the Revolution on the last wave of Protestantism. And even German orthodoxy, forced into a purely apologetic position by the extraordinary growth of historical study and infidel criticism, has seemed to be making a breach rather than an alliance between Christianity and civilization. At a time when the social and political sciences, in all countries, are pursued with unprecedented vigor and success; and when, too, reformers and philanthropists are borrowing the Scripture ideas of liberty, fraternity and charity, and caricaturing before our eyes the Christian community of goods; the leading ecclesiastics of the day continue to represent Providence as a systematic judgment throughout history, civilization as an abortive growth of sin, the Church as a mere training school for heaven, and the millennium as an impending social catastrophe.

And thus sociology, the science of organized humanity, if it is to be thus disorganized by the indifferent spirit, instead of realizing the true ideal of prophecy and philanthropy, would only revive the dreams of mediæval monks and fanatics or amuse us with visionary utopias and reforms.

The Schism in Theology.

In theology, at length, the two antagonists will be found parted from each other as by an impassable gulf.

On the rational side of the science, the new scientific religionists are rendering natural theology wholly independent of the biblical and quietly setting aside the Scriptures as no longer of any scientific authority even upon religious questions. It was but a convenient and logical distinction which the early theists pursued in treating natural religion as a purely rational science preliminary and fundamental to revealed religion; and

the later comparative theologians who are studying the contrasts as well as affinities between Christianity and heathenism, can only construct a new apology for the former at the expense of the latter. But a school of deistical and non-christian writers is now aiming to exalt heathenism to a level with Christianity and exhaust revealed religion in a mere natural or essential religion common to mankind. St. Simon, Leroux, and Comte, as we shall see, endeavored to invest this new religion of humanity with the sanctions, rites and obligations hitherto appertaining to Christianity or Catholicism. Atheistic as such a religion would be, Mr. J. Stuart Mill ventured to suggest that even Christians might find in it an instructive and profitable object of contemplation. Professor Huxley, though depreciating it as mere Catholicism without Christianity, only substitutes for it another which he vaguely describes as a sort of Calvinism without Christianity. And Mr. Frederick Harrison claims it as the only positive religion, in comparison with which Mr. Spencer's Unknowable Somewhat is the mere ghost of a religion.

If some eliminate the Christian element from religion, others would introduce into it heathen elements. The Westminster Review long since complained that Christian advocates stigmatized pagan antiquity as profane history, alike denying the divine elements in heathenism and the human elements in Christianity. Dr. Thomas Inman in his voluminous work on "Ancient Faiths embodied in Ancient Names," though admitting that the teachings of Christ may have been originally simple and pure, endeavors to trace all Christian as well as Pagan symbolism to a primitive sensual culture, and ventures to associate sacred names and emblems with the grossest ideas and images. Advanced Deists, such as Theodore Parker, Fox and Mackay have maintained that the only real revelation of God is contained in the universe or in the moral constitution of human nature common to all ages and countries; and that Christianity has added little or nothing but a few popular symbols to the truths already uttered in the Athenian prison. Mr. Samuel Johnson describes this catholic Deism as now escaping contemporaneously from Brahminical and from Christian dogmas; just as the electric wire begins

to encircle the material globe and all the relations of trade, science and politics are becoming œcumenical. Numerous writers on comparative theology, without avowing any hostility to the Christian revelation, virtually obliterate it by treating it as a branch of mythology; and Max Müller himself repudiates the old classification of religions into the natural and revealed as wholly useless for scientific purposes.

On the revealed side of the science, however, in the last stage of complete indifference, we may now behold an independent biblical theology, which would openly repudiate the whole scientific theology as of no dogmatic interest or apologetic value. Some few large-minded divines there may be, such as Ulrici, Patton and Krauth, who discern the common ground between natural and revealed religion; who vindicate the former as fundamental, or at least preliminary to the latter; and who may even seek to bring them into a just harmony, consistent with the supremacy of the one and the integrity of the other; but the treatise has yet to be written which shall reduce them to a systematical body of Christian science. And the vast majority of modern theologians accept this schism as unavoidable and even unimportant. Though the physical and mental sciences are shedding increasing light upon the open page of Scripture; though the ancient religions, with their traditional and innate truths, are coming into closer contact with the one pure revelation; and though the countless sects around us are but fragments, more or less alloyed, of a common Christianity; yet the great historic Churches, with all their learned chairs and pulpits, still remain in an attitude of mutual avoidance and exclusion, each as to what lies beyond its own pale. The oldest of them, the Greek Church, exscinding Romanism, stands between Heathendom and Christendom, like a venerable ruin, overgrown with traditional dogmas. The Roman Church, exscinding Protestanism, stands at the centre of Christendom, like a beleagured fortress, fulminating its syllabus against all modern science and culture. Even the Protestant Churches, exscinding one another, seem content only to fight their old polemics over again within the lines, or to shut themselves up in the citadel of orthodoxy and turn their fire against their own sentinels and defenders, while the hosts

of infidelity are mining and marching around them. And commingled with these various Churches are the innumerable sects, each of which fancies it possesses the only true divine knowledge, that entire religious sense of scripture, reason and nature, which neither the fathers, nor the schoolmen, nor the reformers, nor any later divines, nor yet the sages and saints of all time, had ever before extracted.

And thus theology, under the indifferent spirit, on the one side, would wither away into a mere rational religion, little better than paganism, and on the other side, would be forced into some narrow creed, too insignificant to be named.

The Schism in Metaphysics.

Passing beyond the physical and psychical sciences into the recondite region, common to them all, denominated metaphysics or ontology, the science of absolute being, we shall there find the two antagonists, the sciolists and dogmatists, ranged in opposing lines, like two marshalled armies, through the entire field of thought and research.

On the rational side of metaphysical science, in a state of schismatic separation, we behold a metaphysic asserting its independence of all revealed religion. In some of the earlier ontological speculations it may have been both convenient and reverent to use such technical terms as the Absolute, the Infinite, the First Cause, instead of the sacred names of God employed in common life and worship; and there may have been a great advantage in protecting the metaphysical as well as physical sciences from the encroachments of rash theologians who were in haste to attribute divine intentions in nature and history which are unfounded and misleading. But a class of metaphysicians has arisen who would evaporate the Absolute and Infinite into mere abstractions or impersonal powers, with no correspondent divine realities, and who will not admit into the obscure province of metaphysics any light of revelation concerning the First Cause and the course and object of the universe, about which they speculate so freely. The imposing theories of the world which have followed one another in the schools of Germany, from Kant to Hartmann, are but so many vain attempts to solve the most peculiar

problems of revealed cosmology, or, as Hegel himself expressed it, to re-think the whole thought of the Creator through all the logical categories of His creative process. And this unphilosophical exclusion of the chief source of true metaphysical knowledge has become conscious and avowed in the schools of Comte and Spencer, whose principles would render any divine revelation of the Absolute Cause of the universe simply inconceivable and impossible.

In a more practical form the same indifferent spirit is shown by those discursive scientists who, without calling themselves metaphysicians, are indulging in the freest speculations upon the origin of life, and mind, and design in nature. Sir William Thomson seems to have illustrated it, either ironically or unwittingly, in his Presidential Address at Edinburgh, when he proposed to explain the first appearance of living germs upon our earth, without invoking an abnormal act of Creative Power, by referring them to life-bearing meteors which had brought them from other planets. Professor Tyndall, in his Belfast Address, after sketching the evolution of all animate nature and human consciousness from primitive atoms as the seeds of things, termed the whole process, the manifestation of an absolutely inscrutable Power, and discarded the theory of a Creator as that of a mere man-like artificer. Professor Huxley, in his Evidence of Man's Place in Nature, holds to a similar great natural progression, without any intervention, from the formless to the formed, from the inorganic to the organic, from blind force to conscious intellect and will; and has declared that the doctrine of natural selection gives the death-blow to teleology by requiring no more forethought and design than is seen when the winds of the Bay of Biscay select the sands from the plain, or a frosty night preserves the hardy instead of the tender plants. And Professor Hæckel, as a materialistic monist, in his Natural History of the Creation, renouncing the theory of Agassiz as but the absurd doctrine of an anthropomorphic deity, declares that the forming of the crystal, the flowering of the plant, the generation of animals and the mental activity of man, are alike due to mere mechanical, undesigning causes and, in fact, that in the

so-called economy of nature no such thing as design exists, any more than the much-vaunted goodness of the Creator.

On the revealed side of metaphysical science, in the same schismatic state, we may find a biblical cosmology, which seeks to exclude from itself all ontological thought as profane and worthless. At the dawn of the great reformation of religion it was not strange that zealous evangelists, like Spener and Wesley, should prefer practical piety to a mere speculative orthodoxy; nor indeed is it now surprising that godly divines, such as Tholuck and Hodge, should be jealous of an excessively metaphysical discussion of theological problems as tending to arid intellectualism or rationalism. But there is a class of biblical cosmogonists or theological world-builders who would neither allow the legitimate exercise of the speculative propensity upon the problem of the universe, nor seek to meet its cravings with that solution afforded by divine revelation. Though their own theologies and theodicies are based upon metaphysical principles, derived from pagan as well as Christian sources; though school after school of thinkers have been waging logical warfare around them like the battles of giants; and though at length has been elaborated that ideal of an Infinite and Absolute Reason pervading nature and history, which can only be realized in the triune Jehovah, who is Maker, Saviour and Judge of the world; yet they are content still to represent the Creator as a wearied artificer, resting from His work, the creation as a mechanism with which He constantly interferes, and the creature as an anomaly in His creation.

And thus the metaphysical sciences, as torn asunder by the indifferent spirit, would either, on the rational side, relapse to mere godless abstractions, or on the revealed side, shrivel into lifeless dogmas.

The General Rupture in Philosophy.

Mounting at length above the sciences into that lofty region of Philosophy, where they are themselves to be studied in the pure light of reflection, we shall discover the two antagonists propounding opposite theories of knowledge, like high contracting sovereigns, with their distant armies encamped in full view.

On the rational side of philosophy, as in each science, certain thinkers in our day have theoretically as well as practically abandoned both the idea and the fact of a revelation as no longer of any philosophical value. It was not strange that the earlier philosophers at the Reformation should have carefully distinguished the provinces of reason and revelation as at least theoretically separate; that Bacon should have insisted upon giving to faith the things that are faith's, or that Descartes should have deferred to revealed verities as a distinct order of truths. Nor has it been strange that some later philosophers, from motives of convenience and reverence, should exclude the sacred phrases of religion from the jargon of science; that Cuvier, as he scaled the summits of natural history, should have ascribed to a personification, styled Nature, those sublime intentions which he adored in the all-wise Creator; or that Hegel, as he sounded the depths of metaphysics, should have attributed to an abstraction, termed the Absolute, those rational perfections which he worshipped in the self-existent Jehovah. But it has been reserved for another and very different race of philosophers, in our time, to put such mere personifications and abstractions in place of the revealed realities, to claim the problems of revelation as soluble by reason, and to supersede the infinite knowledge of God with the finite knowledge of man. Some of the German absolutists have virtually usurped the function of omniscience by including in their systems the unrevealed, if not unrevealable mysteries of premundane theology, as well as the entire superstructure of the physical and psychical sciences. Exhibiting to us the whole intelligible universe, nature, man and God, as developed by mere thought or logic from the original ego of Fichte, or the absolute reason of Hegel, or the primordial will of Schopenhauer, they would have left us no room in philosophy either for a revelation or for any revealed wisdom and knowledge.

With such philosophers must be classed others whose irreligious or non-christian indifference has been openly avowed and maintained as an essential part of their theories of cognition and systems of science. The French positivists, as led by Auguste Comte, simply ignored all revealed knowledge

as metaphysical and therefore unscientific, leaving it still possible for a Christian thinker to fill the void by his own cognitive doctrine of a revelation. But the English agnostics, as led by Herbert Spencer, have entered the metaphysical realm with the contradictive logic of Hamilton, seeking to render God unknowable and a revelation therefore impossible. In that realm the Christian divine, if he will, may build up some doctrinal system upon pure faith or mere superstition; but the philosopher must abandon it as no longer a region of actual knowledge or science. Mr. Lewes calls such theologians "metempirical speculators," and likens them to the hapless seekers of perpetual motion. The result is that we have writers on the logic of the sciences, like Comte and Stuart Mill, wholly ignoring revelation as a source of metaphysical knowledge, and classifications and systems of the sciences in which revealed theology has not even a place or a name.

Moreover, the same unphilosophical spirit has appeared practically in certain speculative scientists who have endeavored to define the nature and limits of empirical research. Mr. Parke Godwin, in an eloquent address on True and False Science, has exposed their irrational and irreligious attempts by mere induction to settle problems which can only be solved by revelation, such as the origin and end of the world, and the whole course of the universe. Professor Youmans has replied to these strictures, that science by its own expansion, is bringing such problems within its scope; that it can know no limits but those which nature itself imposes; and that it must pursue its course independent of any religious considerations. Professors Huxley and Tyndall are solicitous that metaphysicians and theologians should let physical science alone, while they are themselves invading the whole region of natural theology and metaphysics with the freest speculations upon force, mind, causality and design. Hæckel dismisses all religious faith from the same region as mere superstition; and in his tract on "Freedom in Science and Teaching" denounces the wise restraints of Virchow and DuBois Reymond as mere religious scruples.

On the revealed side of philosophy, meanwhile, some leading theologians openly accept their banishment from the whole

rational region and remain fixed in that state of complete indifference, where all human knowledge is to be repudiated as of no religious value, and without significance either for the defence and explication of the Scriptures, or for the completion of a true and pure philosophy. It was but natural, perhaps, that the reformers, such as Luther, Calvin and Turrettin, should have been so absorbed in their great work of reconstructing theology upon a purely scriptural basis as almost to overlook the rising science of their time and treat philosophy herself as a mere handmaid to divinity. And it has only been prudent in some later divines to resist the advances of such scientists as would have foisted crude or false hypotheses into their biblical interpretation and to deny the claims of such philosophers as would have set bounds to revelation and prejudged its most peculiar mysteries. But we have other theologians, of smaller mould and narrower vision, who seem to have quite forgotten that nature is a divine revelation as well as Scripture, and that the Bible may have its incidental uses in purifying and perfecting all knowledge, human as well as divine, secular as well as sacred. Their well-known dictum is, that the Bible was not designed to teach science, but may even reflect through its popular language the errors of former unscientific ages and rude peoples. As to the physical sciences, especially, they will press their theory of a divine reserve and silence, though they may themselves have constructed a biblical psychology or a Christian ethic out of figurative proof-texts and set forth in Scripture terms a metaphysical divinity more rash and subtle than the vainest philosophy.

The practical forms of this unphilosophical spirit are very various. The apologete is led by it to take an offensive bearing toward all the sciences, and only sallies forth among them to capture some new discovery or speculation which can be converted into a defensive bulwark, or displayed as an evidential trophy in the fortress of the Christian faith. Within these outer ramparts the exegete lays the foundations of strictly biblical knowledge with profound learning, but often in ignorance, and sometimes in defiance of all surrounding knowledge, both physical and metaphysical. He comments

upon Genesis and the book of Job as if he had never heard of the natural sciences; he extracts from the Decalogue and the Beatitudes a morality which has no need of any later ethics or politics, if it be not plainly opposed to them; and he unfolds from the old and new Testaments a purely revealed religion, which has cast off all forms of natural religion as the mere refuse of its own divine development. At length, near the centre of these apologetical and exegetical outworks, on some narrow confessional basis, the dogmatician builds up a systematic theology, for which only the church fathers, or the schoolmen, or the reforming divines can furnish materials, but from which all earthly science must be carefully rejected as but untempered mortar in the walls of Zion. Let any inmate now seek to restore the lost connections of nature and scripture and proclaim the harmony of science and revelation, in the interest of philosophy as well as religion, and straightway he must be put under espionage as a disguised rationalist, if not driven forth as a deserter from the orthodox faith.

And the resulting evils are chronic and almost hopeless. Some profound and intelligent divines there may be, who have begun to discern the essential relations of reason and revelation and aspire to adjust them; but the ideal of a true Christian Philosophy, harmonizing and organizing all knowledge, divine and human, if clearly grasped, is but treated as a vain fancy of the fathers or an exploded dream of the schoolmen. Not only do the more obscure and illiterate sects simply denounce all philosophy as false and worthless, but even the great enlightened Churches, though living in an age distinguished for the intellectual grandeur of its speculations, though surrounded by formidable systems which are wielded both for and against the Christian revelation, and though themselves maintaining creeds which traditionally involve elements of the Greek, Roman, and even Arabian philosophies, seem neither to desire nor to expect anything more perfect than their own little systems of knowledge, which neither exhaust the whole of divine revelation nor include any part of human science.

And thus philosophy, the very guide of the sciences, instead of mounting towards the fullness of knowledge, is but

left by the indifferent spirit on the one side to wander in the blindness of uninspired reason, or on the other to crouch in abject pupilage at the feet of mere human authority.

The General Rupture in Civilization.

Returning at length from these heights of philosophy and science to the busy world below, in search of the practical issues of the great schism, we shall find ourselves passing between divided interests and forces, the one worldly and the other sacred, held apart with reserved antagonism, like bristling armaments in a time of siege.

On the worldly side of life we behold a civilization which, for three centuries, has been steadily departing from Christianity. Released at the Reformation from the false Christian culture of the middle ages, it has advanced with growing worldliness through every sphere of human activity. The first diverging step was the secularization of literature. Ficino, the two Picos, the Medici, as we have seen, toward the close of the fifteenth century, had brought Grecian letters into Italy, face to face with the barbarous Latinity of the schoolmen. Reuchlin, Erasmus and Agrippa, in the beginning of the sixteenth century, had revived the humanities in Germany, amid general laughter at the pedantry of the monks. Montaigne and Molière, toward the close of the seventeenth century, infused a classic grace into the belles lettres of France, with a genial scepticism which did not yet need the scoff of Voltaire. Pope and Shaftesbury, at the rise of the eighteenth century, arrayed English letters in the artificial graces of that genteel deism, which had recoiled from what M. Taine calls the Christian renaissance of the previous Puritan age. At length, toward the close of the eighteenth century, German literature reached a like crisis in the refined paganism of Mendelssohn, Lessing and Gœthe. And now, in our own time, we scarcely needed the laments of a Wordsworth and a Tennyson, or the satires of a Dickens and a Thackeray, to show us that the Christian romanticism of Spenser and Bunyan is gone.

With this literary apostasy has followed a like secularization of art. Breaking loose from the fostering care of the

Church, it has but wandered away like the prodigal to the husks and the swine. In every department there has been the same prostitution of beauty to error and vice. In painting, the Madonna of Raphael is rivalled by the Venus of Titian. In music, the oratorio of Bach is exchanged for the opera of Verdi. For the miracle-plays and mysteries of a believing age, are substituted comedies which turn life into a farce and religion into a jest. The solemn temples, once reared for the celebration of the awful tragedy of the cross, are deserted for theatres too profane for even the heathen Graces to haunt; and there is no collection of modern art which might not yield the stale moral that the Christian muses have fled.

Not far behind this degradation of art has also proceeded a secularization of science. Issuing forth from the cloister as with new-born freedom, she has been recruiting her votaries from the world, until they rival the priests and scholars of the former age. Bacon, in his New Atlantis, had already dreamed of some blessed isle of science, adorned with a Solomon's House, to whose mysterious chambers physical observers were returning from all parts of the globe as merchants of light. Cowley, who sang in stilted verse of the great Lord Chancellor of Nature's laws, then projected, near London, his ideal College of pure research for the advancement of experimental philosophy. Condorcet, whose fragment on the New Atlantide still more gravely treated the romance of Bacon, sketched his universal republic of science, in which all nations should be joined together at some centre like that of English America, in grand explorations and discoveries for the good of the human race. And soon, in fulfillment of such dreams, came as much of them as could be made real. Among the colleges of surpliced scholars grew up the Royal Society of London; beside the Sorbonne arose the Academy of Sciences at Paris; and throughout Christendom, in the very midst of its Churches, spread that increasing fraternity of scientific associations which has at length been crowned with the Smithsonian Institution, for the increase and diffusion of knowledge among men. The crusades of the middle ages have been matched by great scientific expeditions to the frozen North, to the burning South,

to the ruins of the East and to the wilds of the West. Communicating observatories, searching the heavens on all sides of the planet, have taken the place of the old astrological tower. The mystic chamber of the alchemist has become a laboratory. Cabinets, museums and gardens have brought living nature in full view of the musty libraries of theology. And science, the once persecuted child of the Church, is boldly demanding admission to its highest seats of classical and sacred culture. Professor Youmans, in his work on the Culture demanded by Modern Life, arrays the chief scientific authorities of the age in behalf of the new education. Mr. Herbert Spencer, in his treatise on Education, makes science the beginning and end of all physical, mental, moral and religious training, and predicts that, like Cinderella, after having been the drudge, she will yet become the queen of her haughtier sisters in the realm of learning. Mr. Grote would have all religious instruction legally excluded from the academic curriculum. And great universities are already seeking to banish Christian science as a thing of the past.

At a still more practical remove has also issued the secularization of politics. Emancipated from ecclesiastical tyranny, the state in all its forms and with all its interests, has been steadily asserting its independence of religious ideas and influences, until now it stands forth as the embodiment of mere worldly power and grandeur. At the beginning of the movement the mediæval theocracy, which had held all nations subject to the Roman Pontiff, dissolved into a mass of jarring monarchies, settling at length under the Balance of Power. The succession of crusades which had melted all Europe together by one fiery impulse, was followed by the distracting wars of Catholic and Protestant states, terminating in a peace at Westphalia, which thenceforth excluded religious questions from the cabinets of statesmen. The sacred compact of king, lords and commons with pope, bishops and clergy, was exchanged for the intestine wrangle of sects for place and power, ending in a mere state-religion, as in England, or in the subjection of the Church, as in France, or in its absolute separation, as in the United States; and even where the forced union still remains, the wedge of disestablishment is already work-

ing, as in Scotland, Ireland and Italy. And whilst these external separations were proceeding, still greater secular changes have been wrought in the very theory and structure of the State itself. That divine right of government in all its forms, once so sacredly believed, has yielded to the notion of a social contract and written constitution; that supreme rule of the King of kings, once universally acknowledged, is obscured by the ever-boasted sovereignty of the people; and that Christianity, once potent throughout the state, is but a public sentiment so distant and vague that the very idea of a Christian commonwealth is treated as a utopian dream.

And now at last, in the wake of all these movements, there is even an attempted secularization of religion itself. The New Christianity of St. Simon and Fourier has been followed by the more sober Christian socialism of Maurice and Kingsley, virtually identifying the kingdom of Christ with the state and obliterating the distinction between the church and the world. And at length has appeared the so-called "Secularism" of Holyoake and Conway, who would make science the only Providence, and exhaust religion in the duty of attending to the present world, which is certain, rather than a future world which is uncertain. Scientific knowledge is to take the place of decaying faith and be propagated by zealous disciples. Professor Tyndall, as its apostle to the new world, eloquently pleads for its toiling votaries that are secluded like monks and anchorites from the luxury of the times. Professor Huxley, as its popular evangelist, spices his Lay Sermons with a genuine polemic flavor. And that forerunner and hierophant of the school, whom they still refuse to own, Auguste Comte, has already projected in the growing future a hierarchy whose priests shall be savants, a catechism which shall teach the dogmas of social physics, and a calendar of scientific martyrs and heroes among whom the Christian apostles and saints are not even to be named.

On the sacred side of life, however, we behold a Christianity which, meanwhile, has been as steadily departing from the accompanying civilization. At the outset protesting against the mere secular Christianity of the middle ages, it

has vacated, with increasing recoil, nearly every realm of worldly interest. It was not strange, in the beginning at least, that Protestantism should have detached itself from literature. Its leaders in the sixteenth century, if we except Melancthon, were too busy with graver studies to cultivate the amenities of scholarship. Luther could not stop to choose classical epithets when cudgelling Tetzel, and, unlike the modern Faust, drove Mephistopheles out of his study with one dramatic burst from his ink-horn. Calvin, it may be conceded to Bishop Horseley, did not knowhow to expound the prophecies with the taste of a secular poet, yet he has passages which might perhaps be oftener quoted by fine writers, could they translate the austere grace of his Latinity. And because John Knox made Scotland ring with his "Blast against the Monstrous Regiment of Women," it is seldom told with what courteous phrase he still knelt to Queen Mary. The authors of Puritanism in the seventeenth century, after we have named Milton and Bunyan, are not among the greater lights of English letters. Bates, the silver-tongued, has been claimed as a theological classic for his Harmony of the Divine Attributes, and Baxter sometimes wrote sentences which recall the pure English of the prayer-book in which he was trained. But Owen, the great scholar of dissent, can be read for no other literary merit than the robust utterance of vigorous thought. John Howe, the author of the Living Temple, indulged in such a harsh and rugged style, that few can now relish his massive argument. And Rouse, the poet of the Westminster Assembly, has inflicted upon successive generations to this day, a version of the Psalter which should neither be said nor sung. The Covenanters had no writers that could redeem them from their literary outlawry by Scott and Burns. The Methodists, who might have learned better from the hymns of Wesley, declared war against literature as but a vanity of the world. And the Quakers actually tried to murder English itself. How could the man of letters be other than a mere worldling?

It was not more strange, perhaps, that the whole region of art should likewise have been deserted. The reformers, whilst dealing with an æsthetic ritual which expressed to them

nought but pernicious error, could not be other than iconoclasts, and through the successive phases of Puritanism, Methodism, Quakerism they passed, until they stood in rugged antithesis to all the grace and beauty of life. That architecture, which had been based upon the very form of the cross and aspired in bewildering magnificence towards the same glorious symbol in the heavens, was pronounced a mere monument of superstition, and exchanged for debased models of the heathen temple or the plainer chapel and meeting-house. The painting, sculpture and scenery, which had been designed to exhibit the Christian altar, priest and sacrifice, in storied light, amid pictured saints, apostles and martyrs, were ruthlessly defaced as mere relics of idolatry, or gradually replaced by the bare lecture-room, pulpit and scholar's gown, until even these disappeared in a meeting clothed in monotonous drab. The music and oratory which had rehearsed, as in high sacred opera, through a trained choir, the versicles, canticles and collects of all ages, were abruptly translated into the mother-tongue of the assembly, together with an incongruous mixture of exhortations, confessions and thanksgivings, or were wholly repudiated, at first for the new-made liturgy and stately sermon; then for pulpit rant and random outcries, and at length for leaden silence, broken only by the sanctimonious whine. No wonder the Muses were scared back to their native haunts.

It was scarcely less surprising that the province of science should also have been more or less abandoned. It had been the mistake of Protestantism as well as Catholicism, not to welcome betimes the new knowledge growing up beside them; and the educational policy of the Reformers and Puritans naturally fostered religion somewhat at the expense of science. The classics, mathematics and metaphysics of the scholastic system were retained mainly as a good foundation for divinity, while the natural sciences were left to run wild beyond the pale. The universities of the old world, as transplanted to the new, were broken into a multitude of denominational colleges, designed as nurseries for the ministry, with a prudent toleration of candidates for the other learned professions. The Faculties of Law, Medicine and Philosophy, which had been joined with Theology, were relegated to their

respective votaries, and that of divinity erected into a separate seminary or training-school for the clergy, founded on some definite Church confession and placed in a somewhat polemic or apologetic attitude toward all other learning. The whole republic of science was fenced off by the guards of orthodoxy as secular or profane, the wisdom of Egypt and mere spoils for the children of Israel. What else could result among scientific men than a pagan worship of Nature?

It was but a further consequence, that the entire domain of politics has also been surrendered as essentially worldly and sinful. Breaking loose from entangling alliances with the state since the Reformation, the Church, in all its forms and with all its powers, has been gradually separating itself from political institutions and influences, until now it appears as a purely spiritual organization, aiming only at eternal interests. At the outset, the false supremacy of the Roman Papacy over European monarchies was broken by the great Protestant revolt; to this succeeded the Puritan dissent from the Anglican prelatical establishment; and at length, in the United States, has followed the complete separation of all churches and denominations from the government, and their mutual independence and equality before the law. And this result, so far from being enforced or deprecated, has been accepted and wrought into the very theory and policy of the Church itself. That claim of an absolute theocracy, once so arrogantly urged by pontiffs and prelates, has been exchanged for tame submission, voluntary disestablishment, and even organized dissent. That compulsory Christian training of the whole population, once so tenaciously held as the chief function and duty of the Church, has given place to state-schools, from which the Bible itself is to be excluded as too sectarian for a text-book. And those different forms of civil polity, once so studiously defended with Scriptural arguments, have been followed by constitutions in which there is no Christian idea or name, and which are often treated as mere worldly expedients or organized revolts, soon to be crushed under the universal monarchy of Christ. Was it strange that statesmen should study only heathen models and the very name of politician become a reproach?

And now it is only the last result of the growing rupture, that the whole secular side of religion itself has been abnegated as earthly and unholy. Though it was the boast of Protestantism that it came to restore the humane virtues as well as the godly graces and to promote the temporal with the eternal welfare of men, yet the old ascetic spirit, without the causes which once justified it, still shows itself, not merely in a needless seclusion of the church from the world, but in a harsh and false separation of theology from practical ethics, of doctrine from daily duty and of worship from common life. Those gentle qualities of honor, bravery and courtesy, and those more sterling traits of honesty, veracity and fidelity which historically grew up with the feudal and commercial systems and are normally but the flower and fruitage of the Christian faith, are sometimes found disowning as well as disowned by its professed disciples. The great charities and philanthropies for the relief of the poor, the sick and the degraded, which were once devised and managed by the clerical class as their fit prerogative, have been passing into secular hands, and are often pursued in an irreligious spirit. And a sanctimonious depreciation of whatsoever things are lovely and of good report, so far from being always unconscious and thoughtless, has been fostered by the teaching as well as practice of certain sects and parties, who inculcate from perverted Scripture texts the unscriptural dogmas, that human society is too depraved to be regenerated, that social crimes and miseries are incurable, that all natural virtue and morality are illusory and worthless; in a word, that this world is to be abandoned as but the kingdom of Satan, and the coming kingdom of Christ anticipated only as a fiery judgment, or sort of grand *auto-da fe* of the whole existing civilization. Is it any marvèl that reformers have been looking for another Gospel and a new Christianity?

Such are the extreme issues of the schism we have traced. Thus the indifferentists, on both sides, remain fixed in like seclusion, and in their tendency are alike distracting. So long as the two classes, the scientific and the religious, thus avoid each other, a kind of intellectual duplicity must needs be fostered and rival arbiters of truth set up for the decision of the

most momentous questions. The experiment they are making, though unconsciously, is that of holding one thing in religion and another thing in science, or of rendering science irreligious and religion unscientific; while practically it tends to an utter divorce of Christianity and civilization, with an extravagant development of each, which would only make their collision the more fearful and disastrous, whenever, in any great social crisis, they should rebound from the forced separation.

Now, as we found it with extremism, so it is with this indifferentism: the two parties proceed upon a false view of their normal relations. Though they are not antagonistic, yet neither are they indifferent. Though they need not oppose, still less need they avoid each other. However distinct may be their spheres, there is, notwithstanding, intersection and common ground. However diverse may be their methods and aims, there must be interaction and harmony. They, in fact, presuppose each other, and, unless mutually complemented, would be alike powerless and dead. Reason admits and craves revelation; revelation requires and stimulates reason. Whenever, then, any separation arises between them, this, too, is to be treated as anomalous, and in various ways may be proven too serious to be overlooked or palliated.

In the first place, it is a dismemberment of the very body of truth. Even when it involves no strife of words or of opinions, no collision between doctrines and theories, yet behind the show of peace and concord, it leaves the natural sundered from the supernatural, the discovered from the revealed, the human intelligence from the Divine intelligence. As the connection between nature and Scripture ensures the connection between science and religion, any forced severance of them simply tears truth from truth, which God hath joined together.

In the second place, this indifferentism is of an extent involving the whole mass of knowledge. Instead of remaining occasional, it has become progressive and general. We have described it as a vast schism, which had its historical origin in the Reformation, and has since grown and spread through all the sciences with a tide of increasing disruption and anarchy. The time is past when theology could be called their

nurse and mistress. One after another they have been breaking away from their ancient pupilage and running into seclusion and estrangement, until at last the very idea of a God, that only bond which can hold them together, even as it alone can give unity to the totality of phenomena upon which they proceed, has been formally ignored, and it has become the opened secret of the age that infidelity, once metaphysical, is now scientific, and science, once theological, is all but atheistic.

If we seek the traces of this great rupture, we find them conspicuous, not merely in breaches or separations, but also in actual controversies, waged at every point of contact along the entire range of secular and sacred learning. As we have seen, there is no science in which natural facts are not left detached from revealed truths, and revealed doctrines directly menaced by rational theories; while in the eminent domain of philosophy itself, we have the two opposing lines marshalled, as if for a last decisive encounter, by systems which array the embodied results of human research against divine revelation, upon the avowed principle that science, by the law of its growth, can only subsist upon the extinction of theology, and is destined at once to destroy and supersede it. Thus that body of knowledge, commonly regarded as most exact and certain, is fast detaching itself from that body of knowledge long esteemed most sacred and beneficent. And a feeling of the rupture may be said to pervade the whole community of scholars, ranging between the extreme of confident scepticism on the one side, and vague misgiving on the other, with an unsatisfactory suspension of judgment among the conservative classes between them; while among the masses, following the course of all great intellectual movements, it is already diffusing popular influences, which may survive long after it shall have received sentence at the tribunal of philosophy.

In the third place, such indifferentism is, in its issue, fraught with the direst evils. No mere war of words or strife of logic, it is already unfolding its disastrous effects in every sphere of human interest.

As the first class of such evils may be cited that very anarchy of the sciences which has been described. Only the

charlatan of the one side, or the bigot of the other, could be blind to the wild confusion and strife which now reign throughout the intellectual domain. The genuine lover of truth, for its own sake, on whichever side he may be found, instinctively recoils from this widening breach between our knowledge of the works and of the word of God, and craves all possible reconciliation, if only as an intellectual necessity and a rational ideal. That two such vast bodies of science cannot ever remain apart and at variance, but must ultimately coalesce in some logical system, is at once a yearning and a presentiment of the philosophic mind. Next in strength and nobleness to the instinct which longs to have all truth, is that which longs to have all truth consistent with itself.

As a second class of evils, and consequent upon the former, may be named that derangement of the educational system, secularization of learning and sectarianism of the professions, in which the great schism has practically expressed itself. The mere pedants of either side, sundered by professional antipathies that render them almost incapable of appreciating each other's peculiar enthusiasm, will indeed be content with routine labors and special researches, and seek no intellectual commerce beyond their own provinces; but original seekers for truth and actual contributors to the world's stock of knowledge in all the walks of learning, soon find themselves meeting together on the high ground of first principles, and in proportion as they thus realize a community of opinions and aims, will they escape hurtful collision and promote each his own beneficent mission. In seeking thus to found the catholicity of learning upon the unity of science, philosophy puts on the garb of philanthropy, and the lover of truth becomes also a lover of his kind.

As a third and still more obvious class of evils, may be mentioned that scepticism in religion, radicalism in politics, and sensualism in art, both industrial and æsthetic, which are the final results of such schismatic knowledge and culture. A few extremists may affect to regard this sore conflict between reason and authority, order and progress, material and spiritual culture as normal, necessary or incurable; but there are, this hour, in all lands and classes, enthusiastic believers

in social regeneration as at once within the vision of prophecy and the scope of history. And it is by the disappearance of the sectarianism of science alone that they may hope for the disappearance of the sectarianism of learning, religion and politics. For, since the ideas of philosophers at length become the opinions of the people, a logical compact of truth and knowledge among thinkers and scholars must, sooner or later, be followed by a practical compact of institutions and interests among the masses. In thus striving after the perfection of science, philosophy comes to the aid of humanity in its effort after the perfection of society.

It is indeed true, as has already been hinted, that each of these great evils may have some incidental and compensating good. This dissection of the sciences, in so far as it is merely artificial and logical, may be as convenient as it is unavoidable; this professional zeal and academic prejudice, by dividing the task of philosophy, may promote research and erudition; and even the social conflicts of diverse creeds, theories and systems, by carrying the battle of civilization from the region of thought into that of action, may only the more conspicuously relieve truth and virtue against error and vice. But when we have duly acknowledged such mercies of our transitional state, there still remain the duty and the testimony of further progress and higher improvement. Even while we hail such straggling gleams of light, we only see the darkness more plainly and long for the day-spring.

In this manner is it to be shown that the two interests, though they may not be in a state of deadly warfare, are, nevertheless, in a state of direful schism, for the healing of which their respective advocates should yearn and labor. When either the scientist would dream of dispensing with religion, or the religionist of dispensing with science, let both remember the vital bonds which join them in a blessed marriage, and dread any coldness between them, as alike with any conflict, fatal to the cause of truth and humanity.

CHAPTER IV.

MODERN ECLECTICISM BETWEEN SCIENCE AND RELIGION.

Our next polemic scene is to be found in the midst of the collision and shock of battle. The skirmish, the truce, the parley are at an end; the ranks are recalled to arms; the grand charge is ordered; the combatants rush together and disappear behind the clouds of war. In that one supreme moment there is the very sublimity of human hope and daring. But while yet we gaze and wonder, the smoke clears away and we behold simply both armies fleeing from each other in the wildest confusion, neither left master of the field.

And it is thus that certain ardent votaries of philosophy, as Sir William Hamilton phrases it, "would carry the Absolute by assault," vainly endeavoring to conquer the totality of knowledge, divine and human, by one heroic effort of the intellect. Or, as Lord Bacon has expressed it, "some modern men, guilty of much levity, by an unadvised mixture of things divine and human have essayed to build a system of natural philosophy on the first chapter of Genesis, the Book of Job, and other places of Holy Writ, seeking the living among the dead."

We have termed this class of thinkers, whether they appear on the side of religion or of science, the Eclectics, or Impatients, because they are in haste to combine their several fruits of research, the one overlooking the claims of reason,

and the other, the claims of revelation. No border question can arise between science and Scripture which they will not at once force to a settlement. Already sure of the ideal unity of truth, they would also make sure of the ultimate system of knowledge and range over each other's domain in search of materials for its construction; while in the sphere of practice, they will straightway organize upon its basis the ultimate system of society. In a word, they are the knights-errant of philosophy who sally forth to conquer all knowledge by the force of genius or logic and reform the world single-handed.

In contrast with both the Extremists and the Indifferentists, they are in no degree averse to the great reconciliation of divine and human knowledge, but are simply inapt or unfit for the task. Though impressed with the necessity and importance of the work and themselves rightly inclined towards it, yet from some defect of intellectual temperament or training, from a too ardent imagination or versatile fancy, or from an excessive love of symmetry, or from a habit of hasty generalization, or from a lack of special knowledge, they fail to bring the two interests into perfect understanding and rational agreement. We proceed to sketch them more particularly according to the method hitherto pursued.

The religionist of this eclectic spirit is in haste to appropriate into his creed the whole existing product of reason. Throughout the rational province of each science he strays, sifting theories and culling facts to be wrought into his exegesis, in support of his own theological opinions and beliefs. Indeed, he never enters the field of research but with some foregone dogma of the church or private interpretation of Scripture which he wishes to uphold with extraneous aid or illustration; and there is no physical hypothesis so crude, no metaphysical speculation so rash, that he will not compel it to do service in his apologetical or polemical tactics. Science is simply degraded by him from a handmaid of theology to a slave and put to the drudgery of propagandism.

The scientist of this eclectic spirit is in haste to appropriate into his system the whole existing product of revelation. From the revealed section of each science he draws doctrines and texts to be woven into his researches, in support of his

own scientific discoveries and speculations. In fact, he never resorts to the Bible but with some foregone theory of science or tentative hypothesis of his own, for which he seeks divine authority and confirmation; and there is no text too far-fetched, no dogma too absurd to be pressed into a proof or illustration of his physical and metaphysical opinions. Theology, queen of the sciences, is degraded by him into a mere vassal and chained to the chariot of progress.

History yields examples of this impatience, in both of its forms, wherever society has presented that spectacle of conflicting opinions and interests which, as M. Guizot says, is so revolting to a certain class of great minds that they feel an unconquerable desire to introduce order and unity. It was somewhat of this spirit, under its scientific phase, which impelled the later disciples of Plato, in the vain hope of conquering a peace among philosophers, to collect out of the ruins of the last Gentile philosophy that huge agglomerate of systems, Eastern and Western, Greek and Roman, known as the Neo-Platonism. It was somewhat of this spirit, under its religious phase, which hurried the later Greek fathers, such as Clement and Origen, into that crude amalgam of sacred and profane learning which was all that survived the wreck of the first Christian philosophy. And even among the later Latin schoolmen, after scholasticism had narrowed the peripatetic within the pale of the church, there arose now and then some towering genius, such as Roger Bacon and Albert, whose expanded vision and encyclopædic lore were but lofty expressions of the same spirit. But as it was reserved for the Reformation to introduce the great schism of divine and human knowledge, described in the last chapter, together with a consequent anarchy of sects and schools, so it was not until our own times that there could spring up any of that intellectual impatience, that heroic love of truth and order, which the strange antagonism or stranger indifference of the other parties is but fitted to excite and to aggravate. And hence we already behold in both quarters an ardent eclecticism, more or less crude and rash, which would immediately press all religion into the support of science or force all science into the service of religion.

Let it be carefully premised before we proceed to sketch some illustrations of this spirit, that in order to make them complete and serviceable, it will be proper to include in the class of religious eclectics all who do not proceed philosophically in their endeavor to harmonize scientific facts and biblical truths, and among them many who may have the true cognitive theory latent in their minds without elaborating it, and whose work, therefore, will endure and appear in the final system of knowledge. But it obviously forms no part of our present task to discriminate any such verified hypotheses as will thus survive the mere sagacious conjectures which may pass away. Of all the innumerable systems and opinions presented in our coming history of the sciences, there is probably not one which has not been wrought into conscious connection with the Bible; and while some of these constructions already form an integral part of the temple of truth, others are still regarded by their own authors as purely tentative and problematical, and still others were never offered as aught else than the mere recreations of a devout fancy.

Surveying first the physical sciences, we shall there see the ranks of the sciolists and dogmatists ever and anon broken by eager divines or devout naturalists, who for centuries have been sallying into each other's domain without making permanent conquests of truth, until the border fields of religion and science appear strown with exploded errors and fantastic speculations, like antique armor made ridiculous by modern warfare.

Eclecticism in Astronomy.

The whole scientific astronomy has thus been invaded and traversed by the eclectic spirit. From the beginning the existing system of celestial physics, whatever it might be, has been claimed as a province of natural theology for the illustration of the divine power, wisdom and goodness. During the reign of the Ptolemaic hypothesis, for nearly thirteen centuries, the scriptural firmament variously described as an expanse, a canopy, a mirror, was supposed to consist of numerous crystalline spheres one within another, attached to the sun, moon and stars, and turned round the earth by the hands of

angels, in order to produce the beneficent vicissitudes of day and night, and summer and winter. While the old astronomy was yet on the wane, Lord Bacon found the Book of Job still pregnant with its secrets; tracing allusions to the convexity of the heavens as stretched over the pendent earth; to the immutable configuration of the fixed stars, the Pleiades, Arcturus and Orion as ever gently bound to the same relative position in the revolving skies; and to the invisible constellations of the opposite hemisphere as hidden in the chambers of the south. More than twenty-five years after the demonstrations of Newton, the Dutch savant, Nieuwentyt, adhering to the transitional scheme which Tycho Brahe had devised as a compromise with theology, continued to expound the divine wisdom and goodness in enchasing the stars upon a solid sphere concentric with the earth. M. Theodore Martin, in his treatise on the Trial of Galileo, mentions the elaborate works of numerous forgotten writers of the seventeenth century, such as Morin, Rocco, Chiaramonti, Accarisio, Alexander Rosse, Dubois, Scheiner, Kirchmaier, Fabri, Herbinius, and some even in the present century, such as De Bonald, Matalène, Lachèze, and Wrangler, who have continued to advocate the repose of the earth and the motion of the heavens in the supposed interest of biblical truth. And the same geocentric error is still practically countenanced by natural theologians who represent the solar system as contrived for human advantage alone, and the innumerable heavenly worlds as having no other or higher purpose than mere chronometrical signs and luminaries to our little planet.

There is also an eclectic astronomy which is devout and didactic rather than strictly scientific or philosophic in its aim. It often finds poetic expression, as in the stately hymn of Addison with its anti-copernican image of the revolving stars and planets:

> What though in solemn silence all
> Move round this dark terrestrial ball.

It lent a moral grandeur to the Night Thoughts of Young. Dr. Thomas Dick in his Celestial Scenery, Principal Veitch in his popular articles on God's Glory in the Heavens, and Dr. Burr in his Ecce Cœlum or Parish Astronomy have

aimed to render astronomy not only instructive and entertaining, but tributary to practical religion and piety.

It is, however, in the speculative domain of the science, in the treatment of questions concerning the origin and design of the heavenly worlds, that the religious eclectic has loved to revel. The nebular hypothesis had scarcely been formed before it was seized as the Biblical cosmogony or doctrine of creation. It is true, that such germs of the hypothesis as had appeared in the systems of Epicurus and Lucretius were not employed by the fathers or schoolmen or reformers, all of whom were naturally led to interpret Genesis from a geogonic as well as a geocentric point of view, regarding the visible heavens as a mere appurtenance or atmosphere of the earth. It is true also, that the first modern cosmogonists, Descartes, Leibnitz, and Kant, though assuming the Scripture doctrine of creation as the covert basis of their speculations, did not attempt to reconcile the former with the latter, as their only aim was to show how the worlds might or should have been created. But later cosmogonists and divines have sought more directly to combine the views of Herschel and La Place with those of the sacred writers. The author of the "Vestiges of Creation" distinctly stated his belief, that the nebular hypothesis might be reconciled with the Scriptures. Schubert, when he held that hypothesis, described the dim back-ground of the heavens as one unbroken nebulous cloud which could not resolve itself into luminous shapes and glowing spheres of sun and planet until it felt the energy of the divine command to bring forth worlds. Whewell also maintained that, for the enkindling of such a dark, inorganic mass, reason conspires with revelation in requiring the creative mandate, "Let there be light;" and boldly depicted the forming planets, stars, and nebulæ as lumps which have flown from the potter's wheel of the Great Maker, sparks which darted from His awful anvil when the solar system lay incandescent thereon, and curls of vapor which rose from the vast caldron of creation. The late Professor Ormsby Mitchel, in his Biblical Astronomy, declared the correspondence between the nebular hypothesis and the Mosaic cosmogony to be as exact as any current fulfillment of prophecy. And accordingly some recent

advocates of the hypothesis have sought for distinct references to it in various parts of the Bible. Frederick de Rougemont, in his "Revelation and the Physical Sciences," having distinguished the first three pre-solar days as the astronomical part of the hexæmeron, proceeded to identify the formless void of Moses with the nebulous abyss of La Place, and the upper and lower waters of the firmament with the gaseous masses which broke into fiery suns and planets, while one of them cooled and condensed as the solar system including our earth. Professor Tayler Lewis has ingeniously likened this stage of the creative process, with its waters above and waters beneath, to the spectacle which might now be presented to an observer of the aqueous rings of Saturn, if he could view them from the body of that planet. Professor Guyot, in his memoir on "Cosmogony and the Bible," suggests that the "waters above the heavens," of which the Psalmist speaks, are the primitive nebulæ variously distributed in celestial space by Herschel, Mädler, and Alexander, and describes their division, concentration, and organization into suns and planets as respectively the works of the first three creative days. Similar views are held by Dr. John Baptist Baltzer, of the Roman Catholic Faculty of Breslau, who maintains in his profound "Biblical History of Creation" that the formless earth and lightless water of Genesis indicate the primitive matter and universal ether, out of which by so-called Neptunian and Plutonian processes were formed nebulæ, suns and planets; and that in the first, second and fourth days this cosmogony or development of the celestial cosmos proceeds in accordance with the spectroscopic discoveries of modern astronomy, while in the third, fifth and sixth days has occurred the geogony or development of our planet in accordance with the results of palæontology.

The plurality of inhabited worlds is another hypothesis which has been blended with the Biblical angelology or doctrine of angels. For thousands of years the traditional conception of other worlds had been predetermined by a geocentric system, and the Olympus and Orcus of Homer, the Elysium and Tartarus of Virgil, the Paradiso and Inferno of Dante, were alike placed above and beneath the visible

plane of the earth. Even the Heaven and Hell of Milton remained tinctured with Ptolemaic views. But with the downfall of that hypothesis came efforts to adjust the angelic hierarchy to the new Copernican system of suns, planets and satellites. In the very treatise of Galileo may be found some epistles of his friend Antonio Foscarini, a Carmelite friar, designed to reconcile the new theory with orthodoxy by showing how the earth, as it moved in its orbit, might retain its central hells and concentric heavens as still apparently above and beneath its inhabitants. Bishop Wilkins, one of the first advocates of the Copernican system in England, and a founder of the Royal Society, published a scientific romance entitled the "Discovery of a New World," in which he cited the fathers and schoolmen to prove the Moon is paradise, and thought it not impossible that posterity might have commerce with the Lunarians by means of flying ships or chariots fashioned like a wooden eagle. Devout astronomers, such as Huygens and Newton, so far from treating the idea of inhabited worlds with the levity of Fontenelle, thought it consonant with the Scriptures, even if not explicitly revealed. In later times, the Herschels and Arago have agreed with Bode in peopling the sun with the children of light, sheltered behind his luminous corona as within the very glory of the Almighty. And orthodox divines have sought for direct correspondence between the astronomical and Biblical realms of intelligence. Dr. Tholuck could fancy the redeemed finding a congenial abode in the fair savannahs of Venus or the bright plains of Mars, while the lost were consigned to the dreary wastes of Jupiter or the dismal craters of the Moon. Dr. Thomas Dick made his "Christian Philosopher" speculate upon the magnificent scenery of Saturn with his belted skies, Jupiter with his procession of moons, and the fixed stars with their dazzling suns as seats of life and intelligence adorned by the Creator for the worshiping host of heaven. Eloquent preachers descanting upon the fancy of Bradley and Mädler have supposed the central sun may be the royal seat and court of the great Creator and Governor of worlds, around whom adoring suns and planets revolve as tributary provinces in obedient loyalty and praise. Professor Lange, uniting the speculations

of Herschel with the revelations of St. John, in his "Land of Glory," hailed the innumerable orbs beyond our solar system, as the many mansions of our Father's house, the New Jerusalem above, where they need no light of the sun nor of the moon, the very heaven of heavens and holy of holies into which Christ hath triumphantly ascended. And Dr. Kurtz, in his "Biblical Astronomy," rising to a still higher flight has claimed the fixed stars with their luminous, refined structure, as abodes of those pure angels who can know neither birth nor death and who stood nearest the throne of glory as the eldest children of the Creator when the foundations of the earth were laid, while the morning stars sang together and all the sons of God shouted for joy. Shakspeare would seem to have unconsciously expressed the same thought as suggested by the contemplation of the starry heavens:

> "There's not the meanest orb, which thou behold'st,
> But in his motion like an angel sings,
> Still quiring to the young-eyed cherubims;
> Such harmony is in immortal souls."

Such cosmical speculations have even been combined with the biblical soteriology or doctrine of salvation. The descent of Christ into Hell and His ascent into Heaven seem to be acquiring a new astronomical significance. Though at first orthodox divines such as Bellarmin and Melancthon repudiated the idea of inhabited planets as inconsistent with the moral importance of the earth, the incarnation of Christ, and the redemption of man, and regarded them as mythical and monstrous as the fathers had regarded their antipodes; yet when the idea of other celestial orbs and races had become plausible and familiar, ingenious efforts were made to connect them spiritually as well as materially with our world and embrace them somehow within the scheme of the Christian revelation, as either fallen or unfallen, and therefore to be either saved or confirmed in safety through the infinite efficacy of the Cross, by the incidental merits of a Saviour of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named. As if to start such curious problems, Dr. Young, in his Night Thoughts, imagined himself interrogating the inhabitants of a

distant star as to how far their moral history corresponds with our own:

> "Enjoy your happy realms their golden age?
> And had your Eden an abstemious Eve?
> Or, if your mother fell, are you redeemed?
> And, if redeemed, is your Redeemer scorned?"

And to such questions various answers have been given by equally orthodox writers. Dr. Chalmers, in those magnificent prose-poems, his Astronomical Discourses, on the supposition that our earth is the only lost world, combined his great scientific and biblical knowledge to rescue it from its seeming insignificance in creation, by likening man to the solitary sheep astray from the heavenly fold; by magnifying his moral importance in comparison with the telescopic marvels above him as well as in contrast with the microscopic wonders beneath him; and by showing why the higher intelligences around him might desire to look into the mysteries of his salvation, how an intense sympathy may be felt for him in distant parts of the universe, and what a contest for ascendency over him is being waged between the principalities in heavenly places and the rulers of the darkness of this world. The anonymous author of the treatise, "The Stars and the Angels," adopting the same hypothesis, has maintained, on the ground of physical and moral analogies, that the sons of God, the host of heaven, are of the same nature with Adam and Eve in paradise; that consistently with this doctrine, carnivorous animals may exist in the stars as they existed upon our earth before the fall and mortality of man; and that so closely connected are all other intelligent races with ours that there is not an inhabitant of the most distant nebula who is not mysteriously interested in the mediation of Christ. Dr. Kurtz, combining the speculations of Chalmers and Schubert, maintained that the disorder introduced throughout the heavenly hierarchy by the primitive revolt of the angels, as well as that consequent upon the fall of man, is to be repaired through the vicarious atonement of Christ once for all worlds and for all ages, that in Him may be gathered together all things, both which are in heaven and which are upon earth; and therefore designates our solar system as the Judea of the

universe, our planet as the Bethlehem of the heavenly land, and redeemed man as the favored child of Jehovah, to whom sun, moon, and stars make obeisance as in the prophetic dream of Joseph.

Daring as such conjectures may seem, it was but a logical step farther to combine the new scientific cosmology with the biblical Christology or doctrine of incarnation. Early in the mediæval schools it had been held that the chasm between the infinite and the finite, the Creator and the creature, could only be closed, for angels as for men, through an assumption of their respective natures by the Deity, like that of the God-man in Christ; and since astronomy has made us familiar with other inhabited worlds, and geology has suggested their physical and moral analogy to our planet, it has been consistently argued that a divine incarnation may be as requisite for their redemption as for our own. Bishop Butler has hinted it as a thing not antecedently improbable, that in some other globes there might be an inverted predominance of irrational and vicious creatures over the rational and virtuous, and a probable need in some worlds for such a miracle as the Christian revelation. Orthodox Hegelian divines, such as Dorner and Christian Weisse, with their philosophical view of Christ as the Divine Logos or Universal Reason of God, could admit the idea of an incarnation of Deity upon all worlds to be alike demanded by the modern astronomy and the true Christology, even if other planetary races be simply viewed as finite, though unfallen creatures. Sir David Brewster, on the assumption that such races are fallen and salvable, in his treatise styled "More Worlds than One the Creed of the Philosopher and the Hope of the Christian," has recourse to the bold suggestion of a repeated immolation as well as incarnation of Christ, by which under different physical forms to expiate the guilt of unnumbered worlds. And revolting as such a thought may be to many minds, yet it has been poetically expressed by Philip Bailey, the author of Festus, in an imaginary colloquy between the Son of God and the Angel of the Earth:

> "Think not that I have lived and died for thine alone,
> And that no other sphere hath hailed me Christ.

My life is ever suffering for love.
In judging and redeeming worlds is spent
Mine everlasting being."

At length, to complete the picture of eclecticism in this science, we may now behold the entire Biblical history of the heavens already recast in an astronomical form. It had been the dream of the mediæval astrologers, such as D'Abano and Cardan, to link the fortunes of Christianity, past, present, and future, with the march of the stars; and even after the Reformation it was urged, in proof of planetary influence over human affairs, that in the Scriptures the stars were said to have fought in their courses against Sisera, and that the Israelites in Babylon were dismayed at the signs of heaven. But as soon as the folly of connecting the petty concerns of mortals with the revolutions of innumerable worlds had been demonstrated, it then became desirable to gather astronomical evidence of such scarcely credible miracles as the Arrest of the Sun at Ajalon and Recession of the shadow on the Dial of Ahaz, the Star of the Nativity, and the predicted conflagration of the heavens in the last day. As to the first named miracles there have long been orthodox attempts to identify them as true astronomical events rather than mere optical appearances. While the Ptolemaic system prevailed, the fathers and schoolmen taught that there had been a literal stoppage of the sun in his course for a whole day, and that the Book of Jasher is simply cited as corroborative divine authority for the miracle, and not as a poetical embellishment of some natural occurrence. It was likewise held that the sun went back through ten degrees in the reign of Hezekiah, with a receding shadow. And even after the time of Galileo and Copernicus, both Protestant and Catholic divines adhered to these views. Calvin, in his Commentaries, maintained that in answer to the command of Joshua, He who constantly rolls the immense orb of day with indefatigable swiftness was pleased that it should halt till the enemies of Israel were vanquished; and also that when Hezekiah prayed for a lengthened life, the sun was turned back with its shadow through ten degrees of the dial as a sign to the king, that He who made the day could prolong his life. Archbishop Usher, in

his "Annals of the World," argued that by the prodigious and miraculous retrogradation of the sun in the times of Joshua and Hezekiah, as much was substituted for the night as was added to the day, and in proof that the civil calendar was unharmed, referred to the eclipses recorded by Ptolemy and the Chaldeans. Bishop Patrick, commenting upon the Book of Joshua, found plain evidence in the Euterpe of Herodotus that the Egyptians had known of a stupendous alteration in the course of the sun, and even sought for mythical traditions of the event in the story of Apollo, stopping the wheels of his chariot and prolonging the day, in order to listen to a chorus of nymphs, or in the annals of the Theban war, when the sun stood still and blushed at the unnatural murder of Atreus. The learned Buddeus held the same opinion, and Cardinal Cullen has not yet relinquished it; but a number of divines now seek to modify it, by maintaining, more in consistency with the Copernican system, that it was the rolling earth which stood still and not the sun, the optical phenomena being the same in either case. Mr. Greswell, in his work on Catholic Chronology, has calculated that in the reign of Hezekiah, May 31, B. C. 710, suddenly and miraculously, the earth's axial motion was reversed from East to West, and that confirmation of the event may be found in the solar eclipse recorded in the Chinese book of the Shu-king. And some intelligent Protestant divines, while admitting the tremendous disturbance and chaos which such an arrest of our planet would produce all over the globe, if not throughout the solar system, have still insisted that these disastrous consequences might have been miraculously prevented, and that it would have been a worthy feat of Omnipotence thus to deliver the army of Joshua and confirm the faith of Hezekiah.

The Star of the Wise Men has in like manner been a fruitful theme of astronomical speculation. The fathers, such as Eusebius, Augustine, and Jerome seem to have simply regarded it as a new creation in the heavens or in the atmosphere, and dwelt upon its surpassing lustre and purity as a symbol of the star of Jacob, the bright and morning star, and the image of the Father's glory. The scholastic astrologers placed it among the constellations and even sought to cast

the horoscope of Christ. But with the decline of astrology the Reformers sought to restore it as a purely miraculous object, lying beyond the science of the Magi as well as of modern astronomers. Calvin, for example, described it as a meteor or comet which, unlike any natural star, appeared and disappeared and by a devious course pointed the way to Bethlehem. And, in recent times, some attempts have been made to identify it as a strictly astronomical miracle. Horsley, and more recently Hengstenberg, so far from regarding the luminary as a mere astrological sign, have ingeniously argued that it was the star of Jacob or the miraculous fulfillment of a prophecy of Balaam which had become traditional in the heathen world and which the Magi, in common with other devout Gentiles, were then investigating. Dean Trench, in his little treatise on the "Star of the Wise Men," also supposed them to be guided by secret illumination rather than any occult art, and conceived the prodigy itself to have been literally a new star, larger, lovelier, and brighter than any other in the host of heaven, yet probably resembling such variable stars as Kepler and Herschel have sometimes discerned as appearing and disappearing with unwonted brilliancy. Wieseler, a German writer on the Chronology of the Four Evangelists, has argued that while the luminary itself was produced by a natural conjunction of the planets, massed together as an apparent star, yet the real guiding star of the Magi was a comet which, according to some Chinese astronomical tables, was visible for about seventy days at the beginning of the Christian era. Many orthodox divines, however, with Albert Barnes, still regard this star as a meteor or aurora which appeared by divine command in the skies of Persia and Judea; while others, conceding to sidereal astronomy all that it now claims, can find nothing incredible in the creation of a new-born world in the heavens as the presage of a new-born God upon earth.

But of all the themes of biblical astronomy none has so enkindled the fancy of eclectic scientists and divines as the predicted destruction and renovation of the heavens by fire in the day of judgment. So long as the astronomical heavens embraced only the visible firmament and atmosphere, and

were thought to be composed of crystalline spheres revolving with the planets attached, it was easy to imagine such a fabric dissolving in flames, with the sun and moon as red as blood, the stars falling to the earth, the elements melting with fervent heat, the heavens passing away with a great noise, and the new heavens emerging in their place as the purified abode of saints and angels. And consistently with such views the sacred poets and artists of both Catholicism and Protestantism have depicted the coming of the Son of Man in the clouds of heaven, the saints rising to meet Him in the air, the judgment of men and angels, the triumph of the heavenly host, as the successive scenes of a celestial drama yet to open within our visible sky, at the foretold signal of the last great day,

> "When shriveling like a parched scroll
> The flaming heavens together roll,
> And louder yet, and yet more dread
> Swells the high trump which wakes the dead."

But in the progress of celestial physics came the need for some re-adjustment of these tremendous miracles. At first such prodigies as comets and meteors, in the existing imperfect state of knowledge, were supposed to be direct instruments as well as portents of the coming judgment. Whiston, with his unbridled fancy, imagined that a great comet to which he attributed the Deluge was a kind of travelling purgatory, hurrying its wretched inmates between the extremes of heat and cold, from the sun to the borders of the solar system, and predicted the exact date of its return as a visitation of the terrible judgment of God, to destroy the world by fire as before by water. Halley, in like manner, lent his graver authority to the popular fears excited by the dreadful comet of 1680, which two centuries before had spread such consternation over Europe that the Pope had issued a bull for special prayers to avert its approach. Newton also conjectured the burning stars of his day to have been ignited by comets, which might yet combine with other accumulating disturbances in the solar system to enkindle the great catastrophe foretold in Scripture. And the scene of the conflagration itself was made co-extensive with the realms of astronomy.

The English Millennarians,such as Mede and Whitby, understood the elements which shall melt with fervent heat to be the planets and constellations, and cited the fathers to prove that the heavenly bodies shall as truly be dissolved as the solid earth. Chalmers, with his glowing imagination, described the new heavens and earth emerging from a fiery chaos, and space again lighted up with a firmament of material splendor; and, so far from treating the conflagration as either local or metaphorical, he declared, in his discourse on the "Transitoriness of Visible Things," that those solid and enormous masses which, like the firm world we tread upon, roll in mighty circuits through the immensity around us, shall flee away from the face of Him that sitteth upon the throne and no place be found for them. Kurtz, connecting as he does the progress of all other worlds with the moral fortunes of our planet, has maintained that in consequence of the great angelic apostacy the heavens are not clean in the sight of Jehovah, but with all their hosts of stars shall yet be renovated and transfigured by the purifying fires of the final judgment, when Christ with the holy angels shall descend to the earth and forever separate the good from the evil elements throughout creation. Not even the remotest stellar worlds are beyond the reach of such lofty speculations. Helmholtz himself has suggested that the final relapse of planets, suns, and galaxies into igneous vapor might answer to the popular description of the day of judgment. Professor Stephen Alexander, in accordance with his theory of the disrupted and spiral clusters and nebulæ, finds in their very appearance a visible expression of that creative energy which destroys and renews the heavens as but the vesture of the Almighty, that waxes old and is changed like a garment. Doctors Tait and Balfour, in their essay on the "Unseen Universe," have maintained that the predictions of the sacred writers are verified by the modern doctrine of an ultimate dissipation of energy, by which all existing worlds are destined to collapse and vanish like smoke into the invisible ether whence they sprang. Mr. Ethan S. Chapin, in his treatise on "Gravitation in Nature," has argued, that already that force has at times been miraculously suspended, and were it entirely withdrawn, many pro-

phecies of Holy Writ would be fulfilled; the earth would burst and melt with fervent heat, the moon likewise become as blood, the sun be darkened through expansion, the stars fall like meteors, and the heavens depart as a scroll when it is rolled together. And, difficult as it would be even to conceive of such a stupendous miracle throughout celestial space and time, yet eloquent preachers would sometimes seem to imagine that a literal extinction of the sun and moon, falling of the stars from their orbits, rolling together of suns and planets in flames, and passing away of the whole sidereal heavens, with all their systems of worlds, would be a fit closing act in the divine drama of our little orb.

Eclecticism in Geology.

The scientific geology, in like manner, has been ravaged for the spoils of a religious eclecticism. Each successive phase of terrestrial physics has been at once claimed as a manifestation of the Divine wisdom and goodness, and authenticated in the very words of Scripture. For centuries, as we have seen, according to the orthodox geography, the known earth was delineated as an oblong island established upon the floods; with the city of Jerusalem at the centre and four great rivers running to the ends of the earth into the sea and returning in clouds whence they came; with a crystal roof in which angels opened and shut the windows of heaven in order to produce the vicissitudes of the weather; and with a subterraneous cavern from which at any time the purgatorial flames might burst forth in judgment. But when the true physical geography became known, devout naturalists such as Nieuwentyt, Derham, and Ray began to collect more scientific evidences of the divine wisdom in the structure and furniture of man's earthly habitation, anticipating much of Paley's argument, even to the illustration of the watch. M. Bartholmèss, in his Critical History of Religious Doctrines, has enumerated some French writers of the last century such as Réaumur, Bonnet, Trembley, Lyonnet, and Professor Zöckler has added many German authors, the learned Fabricius, Richter, Lesser, Zorn, Heinsius, Rathlef, Ahlwardt, Schierach and Preu, who gathered theistic proofs and illustrations from every

element and object of nature, in treatises with pedantic titles, such as Hydro-theology or an attempt to excite man's love and admiration of his all-wise, all-good and all-powerful Creator by a careful study of the proportions, distributions and properties of Water; Pyro-theology, a similar treatise on Fire; Ehiono-theology or edifying thoughts on the Snow as a wonderful creation of God; Litho-theology or spiritual meditations on the Rocks; Phyto-theology and Petino-theology or edifying study of Plants and Birds; Ichthyo-theology, Testaceo-theology, and Insecto-theology or Demonstration of the perfections of God in Fishes, Mussels, Snails and Insects; Melitto-theology or illustration of the glorious Creator in the wonder-working Bees; Akrido-theology or historical and theological thoughts on Grasshoppers; even Bronto-theology or rational and theological views of Thunder and Lightning; to crown all, Seismo-theology or Glorification of God as shown forth in Earthquakes. And somewhat of the conceit and triviality of these forgotten authors still lingers in our natural theologians who would make the human intellect the sole final cause of mere microscopic marvels which no eye can behold, or find special providences in physical catastrophes which are plainly the result of law or negligence.

In the same eclectic spirit the geological sciences were crudely blended with biblical exposition at every point of contact. The Sacred Physics of Scheuschzer, the Biblical Physics of Schmidt, the Mosaical Mathematics of Reyher, the Hierobotanicon or Sacred Botany of Celsius, the voluminous Hierozoicon or Sacred Zoology of Bochart, and countless other obsolete works of like purport, have only given place to our own Biblical Cyclopedias, designed to encircle the whole Bible with illustrative sciences.

By the same spirit with still more devout aim, the most peculiar doctrines of Holy Scripture have been infused into the commonest phenomena of natural science. To the artless hymns of Watts and Wesley in praise of God's works, were added the evangelical strains of Cowper toward the Father Creator and the orthodox meditations of Hervey on the flower garden, the starry night and the bleak winter. And the classic deism of Thomson, unfolding the varied God of

the seasons, has been followed by a Christian naturalism which would translate the whole course of nature into a parable of grace or yearly gospel to the soul through the senses. A "Sacred Philosophy of the Seasons" has thus been framed out of the scientific and scriptural meditations of various authors by Dr. Henry Duncan, and arranged in the order of the natural and civil year. Dr. Hitchcock, in his "Religious Lectures upon the Four Seasons," has discoursed with philosophic faith upon the resurrections of Spring, the triumphal arch of Summer, the Euthanasia of Autumn, and the coronation of Winter. An English layman, Dr. Chapin Child, has skilfully wrought the latest results of physical research into a scientific commentary upon the winds, waters, fields, mountains, floods and storms which are called to blend their varied voices in the "Benedicite" as chanted in the daily liturgy of the Church. It would seem as if the whole creation, animate and inanimate, as thus attuned by a devout science, were bursting forth into a grand orchestral hymn of praise to the Creator with the blended voices of nature and of scripture.

But it is in the misty region common to Geology and Genesis that the feats of religious eclectics have been most daring and fanciful. During the early crude stage of the science, the old patristic and scholastic modes of interpreting the hexæmeron still lingered. The French quietists sought in it merely a deep spiritual meaning. Madame Guyon, rapt in thoughts of the inner life, in her biblical commentary retraced the six creative days as so many days of grace for the new creature in Christ, from regeneration through the lesser virtues and higher graces to the sabbath of perfect faith and peace. Antoinette Bourignon, a more eccentric writer of the same school, in a treatise on "The New Heaven and New Earth," connected the doctrine of Genesis with a Palingenesia or second Genesis having a second Adam and restored paradise to be literally free from the thorn and the bramble. And Pierre Poiret, the scholastic expounder of the school, in his "Economy of Creation," dwelt upon man as created in the image of the Trinity and as affording a microcosm or epitome of all the works of the creation, while through his redemption

or recreation is yet to be effected a physical renovation of the earth as well as of mankind. The later German mystics, of whom Professor Zöckler speaks, seemed more conscious of the new cosmogonic speculations. After the "Berleburger Bible" with its Ptolemaic view of Genesis and spiritualizing interpretation, came the "Christian Democritus," Conrad Dippel, who fancied the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit strangely coacting with chemical atoms and agencies in the chaos of the forming earth; the "Biblical Meditations" of Hamann, tracing with orthodox fervor the higher truths of Holy Scripture through the successive works of creation; the "Theology" of Oetinger, uniting the fancies of Paracelsus and Boehme with the physics of Newton and Whiston in the exposition of geological processes and events; and the "Cœlestia Arcana" of Swedenborg, with more scientific knowledge unfolding the hidden correspondences of creation and revelation, Genesis and the Apocalypse; as well as the cosmogonic poets, Haller and Vodmer, who in didactic strains sang of the primeval earth and the fall of man and nature. The English theosophists were, if possible, still more extravagant in their interpretation of Genesis. Edmund Dickinson, court physician to Charles II, in a treatise styled "The Ancient and True Physics" claimed to have discovered in the Mosaic hexæmeron an occult science which had been handed down from Moses through the Jewish patriarchs, the Indian Brahmins, the Greek sages, even the Druids and Celts, to be at last identified in the atomic philosophy of Gassendi and Bayle. In like manner, Hutchinson and his followers adhered to a hidden Mosaic philosophy which must not give place to the Newtonian physics or other oppositions of science falsely so-called. And at length William Law, better known by his practical works on "The Holy Life" and "Christian Perfection," founded a theosophic school in which English Methodism was to be strangely blended with French Quietism and German Mysticism for the unfolding of a Mosaic science taught by Boehme and Freher. Poetry, too, threw a golden hue over all this cloudy theosophy. Sir Edmund Blackmore, who was hailed by Addison as a Christian Lucretius, in a philosophic poem styled "The Creation," sang through six

books of stilted verse, the praises of Newton and Harvey against Epicurus, Hobbes and Descartes in a scientific exposition of the hexæmeron. Milton, with his Ptolemaic view of Heaven and Hell, made Raphael describe to Adam how the earth rose out of chaos through the six artist days, by successive fiats of the Creator; and Dryden likened them to a musical climax in the well-known lines:

> "From harmony, from heavenly harmony
> This universal frame began:
> From harmony to harmony
> Through all the compass of the notes it ran,
> The diapason closing full in man."

As geogonic speculation grew more precise in the two rival schools of Werner and Hutton, the eclectic spirit was in haste to make Moses speak as a Neptunist or Plutonist, according as water or fire was supposed to have been used in the creative process. Some early Neptunists, such as Woodward, Scheuschzer, La Pluche, fancied the chaotic earth as a fluid mass out of which the dry land was formed by draining the waters into a central abyss, and showed how these great fountains were afterwards broken up and the six days' works dissolved and stratified by the Deluge of Noah. Later Plutonists, such as Hooke, Ray, Whitehurst, speculated upon the agency of earthquakes in dividing the sea from the land in Genesis and of volcanic fires in the mineral, vegetable and animal creations. Zöckler tells of a "Geogony" in two quartos by Silberschlag who mixed Plutonist with Neptunist views of the Mosaic cosmogony, and described the awfully grand spectacle of the three first days while the mountains and seas were being formed by means of volcanoes and deluges. It is still fancied that Job was a Plutonist, because he speaks of fire turned up from under the earth, and that St. Peter describes the earth standing out of the water and in the water as a Neptunist might tell us of the subsidence of the seas and gradual upheaval of the Alps and Andes.

But since it became probable by the speculations of La Place and Humboldt that the earth has passed through long and stormy epochs from its primitive chaos to its present cosmos, there has been a remarkable attempt to explain the creative process in connection with Satanic agency. The ancient Jewish

and Christian tradition, that chaos was produced by the fall of the angels, has been blended with modern cosmogonic theories. Schubert with daring fancy has maintained that our earth, together with the other planets and the sun, originally belonged to a brilliant astral system or starry nebula, within whose photosphere dwelt the principalities and powers by whom it was dragged down into darkness and ruin and thus made the scene of the new creation recorded in Genesis and verified by geology. De Rougemont, in his "History of the Earth according to the Bible and Geology," described the auroral earth as one of the morning-stars of Job, which was probably the abode of Lucifer and his legions, but through their revolt was converted into that dark, abysmal chaos of Moses, which became the cradle of the whole solar system as since developed in accordance with the nebular theory of La Place. Kurtz, maintaining that other worlds are still pure and unfallen, and consequently restricting the angelic revolt to our own planet, regards the chaotic earth as the residuum of a previous creation, a devastated orb, which was restored to order and beauty through the six creative days, in spite of demoniac opposition. Dr. Anton Westermayer, of Munich, in his "Old Testament Vindicated from Modern Infidel Objections," declares that the organisms which lie petrified in our mountains have only existed upon our earth since it was the dwelling-place of fallen angels, and are but the caricatures and inventions of Satan as he strove to hinder and miscarry the new creation. Delitzsch, starting with a dualistic conception of the world, describes chaos as a sort of non-divine matter, made antagonistic through diabolic agency, and the process of creation as a gradual triumph over Satan, renewed by Christ in the work of redemption, and yet to be completed in the final renovation. And mystical divines in all ages have viewed the whole material creation as a degradation of the spiritual creation, attending the primal fall of the angels.

The same eclectic spirit has also been seeking with intrepid faith to make the long geological eras coincident with the six creative days. During the early and middle ages, and until the present century, there could have been no question as to

the creation of land, sea and sky, fishes, birds and beasts in six days of twenty-four hours, especially since it was held that the very design of the creative fiats was didactic; but with the accumulating evidence of the globular form of the earth, its gaseous origin and igneous nucleus, its successive strata, and extinct floras and faunas, the breach between Geology and Genesis seemed ever widening, and scheme after scheme has been devised for their reconciliation. The *first concordant* scheme would simply have retained the geological eras within days of twenty-four hours. Its advocates, still clinging to the traditional views of Woodward and Burnet, sought to leave the miraculous acts of creation intact and referred the results of palæontology to some subsequent cause or process within the present historic epoch. Mr. Granville Penn, an heir of the American statesman, in his "Comparative Estimate of the Mosaical and Mineral Geologies," maintained that as all plants and animals were created six thousand years ago, the fossil floras and faunas are but relics of Noah's flood. Fairholme, in his "Geology of Scripture," Young, in his "Scriptural Geology," and even the Bridgewater essayist, Kirby, with all their great physical attainments, held to this sort of diluvian dissolution and stratification of rocks, plants and animals as the only hypothesis consistent with the inspired record. Mr. P. McFarlane, with still more remarkable ingenuity, argued that the fossil floras and faunas were but ruins of Adam's fall; and in his "Exposure of Modern Geology" showed how the paradisaic globe might have shrunken in consequence of the apostacy, so as to form vast steppes or terrace-like series of vegetable and animal orders, which were afterwards successively submerged and petrified by the deluge. And Dr. Emmanuel Veith, in his "Origin of the Human World," has not only included all palæontology between Adam's fall and Noah's flood, but declares that the coal measures and turf-beds, volcanic rocks and lava streams are the mere ruins of paradise, no more denoting the proper works of creation than the mossy walls of Nineveh or the cinders of a burnt village.

The *second concordant* scheme would have inserted the geological eras between the six days and some primitive cre-

ation. Its adherents, while granting the evidence of strata, floras and faunas succeeding one another through unmeasured time, have endeavored to find space enough for their development in an interval beforé the present earth was formed. Dr. Chalmers, in his Review of Cuvier, suggested that long after the original act of creation recorded in the first verse of Genesis, there may have occurred the chaos and six days' works recorded in the following verses; and that during that intervening period may have flourished and decayed all the successive dynasties of organic life which geologists now find buried in the crust of the globe, but which would have formed an irrelevant parenthesis in the sacred history. Dr. Pye Smith in his able treatise on "Geology and Scripture," modified this theory of an omitted chapter in Genesis, by supposing that the chaos and six days' work were not only recent but local and supernatural, designed to furnish a paradise for Adam in Asia, whilst the rest of the globe was proceeding as for ages before under natural geological laws. Professor Andrew Wagner, the great palæontologist, in his elaborate "History of the Primitive World," maintained that the first verse of Genesis is a brief summary of the creative works in doctrinal opposition to heathenism and materialism; that the second verse affords a glimpse of a primitive chaos, and that from the third verse proceed the six days' works as new and special creations. Dr. Gerald Molloy, of Maynooth, in his recent treatise on "Geology and Revelation," has carefully collected the opinions of fathers, schoolmen and doctors, in favor of the interpretation that a vast interval of time may have elapsed between the creation of the world and the creation of man; long enough indeed to embrace all the myriad ages which geologists can claim. And in this general view have concurred various writers, such as Buckland, Sedgwick and Wiseman, Reinsch, Keerl and Schubert, Warrington, Paul and Jacobus, who have yet differed as to the nature and length of the six formative days which came after the chaos and original creation.

The *third concordant* scheme would expand the six days into creative epochs coinciding with the geological eras. When it was found that such long dynasties of plants, fishes and animals as are entombed in the strata could not possibly have

been created and fossilized in periods of twenty-four hours, it only remained to review the existing interpretation of the word "day," and in analogy with other scriptures regard it as an indefinite epoch, such as the day of salvation, or the day of judgment, or the day of the Lord; in short, as a vast creative era in the eternal life of that Jehovah with whom one day is as a thousand years, and a thousand years but as one day. Dr. Hettinger has maintained with Faber, that this principle of interpretation, so far from having been forced upon theology by modern science, is as old as St. Augustine, and would not have been new to Bossuet, who termed the Mosaic days six distinct developments. Eminent Protestant divines, also, such as Pusey, Hengstenberg and Tayler Lewis, have held the same opinion on exegetical grounds; and leading geologists, such as De Luc, Cuvier and De Serres, very early favored the attempt to show a correspondence between the biblical and scientific epochs of creation. The late Hugh Miller, in his "Testimony of the Rocks," comparing the fossil series of Cuvier with the successive creations of Moses, endeavored to identify the fourth, fifth and sixth days with the ancient, middle and modern periods of geology, termed the palæozoic, mesozoic, and kainozoic ages, thus affording a scientific interpretation of the second half of the hexæmeron. Professor Guyot, in his Lectures as reported in the Bibliotheca Sacra, adding the astronomical speculations of La Place and Alexander to his own geological researches, has at length completed a magnificent delineation of the whole history of creation, through all its cosmogonic eras, in which is exhibited successively during the first three days the formation of the heavens with their nebulæ, suns and planets, and during the second three days the formation of the earth with its climates, floras and faunas; the former including the azoic ages or inorganic era of matter, and the latter, the palæozoic, mesozoic, and kainozoic ages or organic era of life. But while many leading geologists and divines have thus been agreed in looking for a general correspondence between the two records of geology and Genesis there has been the greatest diversity as to the salient points in the parallelism. Professor Zöckler, in his "Primitive History of the Earth," assigned the palæozoic age of transitional

and carboniferous strata to the third day, when the land was divided from the water, and the first plants and trees were created. Ebrard also agrees with him in postponing the mesozoic and kainozoic ages to the fifth and sixth days, during which were created the fishes of the sea, the birds of the air, and the beasts of the field. Andrew Wagner, Schubert and Guyot, in order to explain the creation of light on the first day, and of plants on the third day, have supposed that as yet the earth was a nebulous star or self-luminous planet, with a photosphere, of which the auroral halo is a remnant, and that then, under the influence of such heat and light, a crude vegetation might have appeared long before the sun, moon and stars could become visible, or the climates and seasons be ordained on the fourth day as a preparation for the great organic epochs which were to follow in the fifth and sixth days. Father Bernuzzi, of Parma, in his "Divine Revelation and Geology," has referred the Laurentian age of fossil plants to the third day, the Cambrian or Silurian age of mollusks and shells to the fourth day, and the Devonian and Jurassic ages of fishes, birds and mammals, to the fifth and sixth days, and has suggested that the inspired writer may have omitted to mention the marine animals of the fourth day as not likely to be observed and unimportant to the narrative. Father Pianciani, in his "Natural Cosmogony compared with Genesis," has maintained that microscopic corals and plant-like animals may have been created even on the third day, and not noticed in the history in accordance with the hermeneutical principle of St. Thomas Aquinas, that Moses only brings forward what is visible to the eye, and distinguishable from the earth by apparent life and motion. Hugh Miller had already suggested a similar view by his theory of an inspired vision which should only exhibit the leading features and characteristic forms in each successive scene of the creation. But Principal Dawson, as if to undermine all these elaborate superstructures, has discovered in the lowest or Laurentian stratum a new fossil animal termed the "Eozoön Canadense," and hence been led to confine the whole palæontological record within the last two days of the creative week.

Such discussions have not been kept within recluse circles and academic shades, but have at length gained a world wide interest on the arena of the "Nineteenth Century" review and between champions renowned in science, learning and statesmanship. Professor Neville, of the College of France, in his "Prolegomena to the History of Religions," while reviewing the "Homeric Age" of Mr. Gladstone, had charged the Mosaic history with scientific errors, such as the creation of the stars before the earth as if for its use alone, and the introduction of the vegetable kingdom before the solar light without which it could not exist. Mr. Gladstone, in an article entitled "The Dawn of Creation," met the former objection by showing the consistency of the first three days' works with the nebular theory of La Place; and the second objection, by stating the normal succession of water, air, and land populations during the last three days as maintained by Dana and Guyot. Professor Huxley, interposing as a geological expert with a paper styled "Mr. Gladstone and Genesis," denounced the business of the reconcilers in general, and in particular denied the succession proposed, since palæontology shows it was sometimes broken or reversed. Mr. Gladstone, in his rejoinder "The Proem to Genesis," gives a sixfold in place of his former fourfold order of creations as substantially in accord with geology, explains that though successive they may overlap, one carried forward into the next; and concludes that the cosmogonic or astronomical part of Genesis is scientifically accurate, while the geogonic part may admit of elucidation as science advances. Professor Huxley draws his practical inference, that the conflict of science is not with religion but with theology. Mr. Gladstone replies that the advice, "Respect religion, but despise theology," is like saying, "Admire trees and flowers, but despise botany." At this point Professor Drummond, of Edinburgh, too much interested to stay out of the fray as a mere spectator, urges that the real quarrel is between the old biblical theology and the new geology; that learned critics have pronounced the Bible absolutely free from natural science; and that Genesis having been written for the childhood of the world is no more scientific than an artless nursery hymn.

The *fourth concordant* scheme, and the climax of the

others, would treat the Mosaic days or geological eras as mere moments or phases of the creative activity. The grammatical and scientific difficulties accumulated in the previous schemes, seem to have occasioned a reaction, especially among Roman Catholic writers, in favor of regarding the sacred narrative as logical rather than chronological, as an ideal and not a real history of creation, sufficiently accordant indeed with science, but mainly designed for religious instruction. The dogma of the fathers, that all things were made at once, has been revived in the light of modern geology. It is argued that nebulæ, suns and planets, strata, floras and faunas must have been created simultaneously, even as they still coexist throughout space and time in the view of Omniscience, and that this simultaneous creation is simply represented by Moses as successive, as a series of six working days measured by sunrise and sunset, in mere accommodation to our finite modes of conception. Mr. P. H. Gosse, an evangelical churchman and fellow of the Royal Society, would seem to have been the first to broach such speculations by an ingenious treatise entitled "Omphalos," in which he argued that as Adam must have been created an adult yet with an umbilicus suggestive of birth, and as the trees must have been created full-grown yet with annual rings suggestive of growth, so the great globe itself must have been created in a mature state yet with strata, floras and faunas suggestive of long geological ages which had never actually occurred. Dr. Michelis of Münster, founder of a magazine styled "Nature and Revelation," and designed for the conciliation of the Church and Science, appears to have supported the mysticism of Augustine with the idealism of Hegel, by designating the creative days, with all their crowded annals, as mere timeless acts or thoughts of God, with whom to create is but to think, and who therefore thinks or creates without any succession of days or ages, the seeming succession in the inspired record being a mere concession to human weakness. Professor Reusch of Bonn, converted to similar views, has abandoned the hope of any exact parallelism between Genesis and geology, and maintained in his "Bible and Nature" that the six days are not six successive periods, but six logically

sequent stages of the creative activity, six actualizing divine ideas, six creative thoughts, and that it is our duty to believe that Almighty God could thus produce the earth as a fit abode for man in a single moment. In much the same spirit Father Walworth has disclaimed any scientific cosmogony in the hexæmeron, regarding it simply as a doctrinal exposition of the first article of the Apostles' Creed. And some Protestant divines, like Dr. Dana Boardman in his eloquent lectures on the "Creative Week," while accepting the results of modern geology and defending the integrity of the sacred record, dwell chiefly upon its high moral meaning and spiritual lessons as prior and superior to any scientific teaching.

At length we may behold the whole biblical and scientific history of the globe blended by a similar eclectic treatment of such geological miracles as the Deluge, the Predicted Conflagration, and the Final Renovation of the Earth. These were favorite themes of the early geologists, when as yet the most extravagant catastrophism reigned in the science. Dr. Thomas Burnet, whose "Sacred Theory of the Earth," published with elegant illustrations, was praised in a Latin ode by Addison, sketched the chief religious epochs of the globe as great geographical changes; first its chaotic egg-like mass at Creation; then its equal nights and days and perpetual spring in Paradise; afterwards its present irregular configuration and climate caused by the Flood; and at length its renewal by the fires of the Judgment. Dr. Whiston then published a "New Theory of the Earth," in which, as we have seen, he verified these moral catastrophes by astronomical events, such as the incursion of comets and the perturbations of the planet upon its axis, causing violent changes in its structure and climate. Dr. Worthington soon followed with a "True Theory of the Earth," aiming to be more Scriptural as well as scientific; but simply becoming still more lavish in its use of the miraculous and catastrophic element. Cuvier, in his "Theory of the Earth," revived a number of these speculations, only himself to add another to the catalogue. And indeed for three centuries the literature of geology was filled with a succession of such sacred cosmogonies, one after another, like children's bubbles, living their little hour of applause.

The Deluge was naturally claimed by the Neptunian school of Woodward as a great terrestrial convulsion rather than a mere moral and local judgment. The whole fossiliferous crust of the globe was treated as its sediment, and all physical geography made to furnish its traces in the abysmal sea, the jagged mountain peak, the indented continent and inland desert, which were supposed to indicate the convulsive effects of retributive justice. An English Rector, Alexander Catcott, published a treatise on the deluge, in which, with the aid of the engraver, he graphically depicted the pre-diluvian world as embracing four concentric orbs: the outer, composed of the waters above the firmament; the next, of the atmospheric heavens; then, the solid crust of the globe; and last, the central abyss or foundation of the great deep, which was broken up at the same time that the windows of heaven were opened in order to produce the flood. The poet Thomson, in explaining how the course of the seasons became disordered, would seem to have had such a theory in mind, as he describes the universal burst of waters "o'er the high-pil'd hills of fractured earth,

> "Till, from the centre to the streaming clouds,
> A shoreless ocean tumbled round the globe."

Supposed relics of such a deluge were piously collected in cabinets and museums and made the theme of learned and devout discussions. Father Torrubia found the remains of antediluvian giants in Spain; Increase Mather forwarded similar relics to the Royal Society in London; and Scheuchzer discovered in Germany the famous fossil infant, or human witness to the deluge, which was afterwards identified by Cuvier as a salamander, but not until it had furnished inspiration for some pathetic verses in which it was apostrophized as an innocent sufferer for the sin of Adam.

The predicted conflagration of the earth was, in like manner, treated by the Plutonian school of Ray and Hooke as a vast volcanic catastrophe rather than a mere prophetic picture of the destruction of Jerusalem, or of the passing away of the present political powers of the world amid great providential judgments. Modern geologists, such as Pye Smith and

Hitchcock, and eloquent divines, such as Griffin, Chalmers and Cumming have continued so to depict it. Its warnings and precedents have been found in the sulphurous storm which destroyed the guilty cities of Sodom and Gomorrah, and in the fiery vengeance which overwhelmed the dissolute inhabitants of Herculaneum and Pompeii. Its materials and portents have been sought in the very structure and aspect of the globe. The whole under-world has been regarded as a vast magazine of combustible materials, ever and anon smoking and kindling as in smothered wrath, "kept in store and reserved unto fire for the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men." The electric flash and shock, the vaster tempest of lightning and thunder, making the whole concave ablaze and resonant, has been claimed as but the mimic rehearsal of that last, dread storm, wherein "the heavens being on fire shall pass away with a great noise." The earthquake and volcano, causing vast continents to tremble over the glowing mass beneath, and mountains to disgorge, like flaming mouths of hell, and to flood whole provinces with molten soil, are viewed as the very process by which yet the elements shall melt with fervent heat and all these things shall be dissolved. And every star that blazes and vanishes away in the night, telling of some other world destroyed, is but a harbinger and pledge of that day when the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up;

> "The cloud-capt towers, the gorgeous palaces,
> The solemn temples, the great globe itself,
> Yea, all which it inherit, shall dissolve,
> And, like an unsubstantial pageant faded,
> Leave not a rack behind."

Both catastrophists and uniformitarians would seem to have agreed in regarding the predicted renewal of the earth as literally a material transformation of its whole structure, scenery and climate rather than a moral and spiritual change in the character of its inhabitants. By the former school of Scripture geologists all the great physical evils of famine, drought and pestilence were treated as the penalties of original sin, the blighting of Paradise by the fall of Adam. The earth was then covered with thorns and barren-

ness, that by the sweat of his brow man should eat bread. The whole creation was made subject to vanity; and instead of the perpetual Spring of Eden was miraculously substituted the distracting march of the seasons through the middle zones with the long wintry nights of the poles; as Milton has hinted:

> "Some say, He bid His angels turn askance
> The poles of earth twice ten degrees and more,
> From the sun's axle; they with labor pushed
> Oblique the centric globe."

After the sin of man had reached its crisis in the Deluge, the ground was to be no more cursed for his sake. The rainbow was then set in the cloud as the sign and pledge of an amnesty between God and the earth, during which summer and winter, seed time and harvest, should not cease. And when this long era of grace is done, and the judgment of the race is completed, the earth shall again be destroyed, then by fire as once by water, and (in the eloquent language of Chalmers) shall melt with a heat so fervent as to be utterly dissolved, and become without form and void, in order that out of the second chaos it may be made to arise with other aspects of magnificence and beauty, as a fit abode of righteousness.

But according to the uniformitarian school of physical geography, the structure of the globe has been simply preadjusted to the mixed character of man as a dispensation of mingled cursing and blessing, and may even be gradually modified through human action, in the progress of religion, science and civilization. Already many of its vast insalubrious regions, by his organized industry, have been made to rejoice and blossom as the rose; its hidden mineral resources, through the long epochs of culture, have been so developed as to produce iron for stone, silver for iron, and gold for brass; its subtle agents of heat, light and electricity have been yoked in his service, until many run to and fro, and knowledge is increased. And if meanwhile, as some geologists tell us, the earth itself is ever slowly nodding through the precession of the equinoxes between the epochs of ice and of fire, or revolving with the sun between nebulous mist and planetary life, that miraculous time might come, when its snows and heats should be blended in

the vernal year of a restored paradise, and the tree of life shed its fruit every month for the healing of the nations.

Eclecticism in Anthropology.

The scientific anthropology has also been entered and traversed by the same eclectic spirit. Animal and human physiology, philology, archæology, as fast as they emerged, have been claimed as biblical sciences, serving to illustrate the divine attributes and to confirm revealed doctrines. Since the time of Augustine, it has been the orthodox faith that the whole human race was created in the divine image, with dominion over the brutes, in a paradise of innocence; but after the fall of Adam, judicially destroyed by a universal flood; then renewed from the loins of Noah in connection with surviving members of the previous fauna preserved in the ark; and at length miraculously dispersed from the Tower of Babel over the face of the earth, in different tribes and nations, with increasing confusion of speech, and ever-lapsing or perverted forms of culture. And in supposed agreement with this anthropology, pious efforts have long been made to trace the effects of the apostacy in animal remains which were buried ages before the appearance of man; to find traditions of the deluge among savage tribes, and the monuments of Babel on remote islands of the sea; and to vindicate the divine vengeance as still expressed in the pains, diseases and deformities which afflict the human frame.

While the fantastic physico-theology was at its height among the Germans, a critic foretold that they might yet have a spermato-theology and zoö-theology or edifying study of living germs and species; and something like it has at length come to pass. In that wonderfully instructive and stimulating book of Professor Henry Drummond, called "Natural Law in the Spiritual World" we now have a so-called Bible Anthropology in which biogenesis is identified with regeneration, mortification with self-denial, conformity to type with conformity to Christ; in a word, the chief evangelical doctrines with mere questions of comparative anatomy. Even the hermit-crab is depicted before us as a physiological backslider, and our current ritualism and dogmatism are dissected and laid bare as forms of Christian parasitism.

But it is in that dim archaic region of anthropology bordering upon geology, where man first appears upon the earth, that the eclectic spirit is now most blindly and rashly venturing. So long as Adam was pictured as a clay image, moulded Promethean-like during the closing hours of the creative week, the sacred record seemed simple and consistent. And even after palæontology had unfolded its vast organic scale of fossil and living species, through countless ages, from the mollusk up to man, it was not very difficult to connect it with the generations of Genesis. Indeed, by the great majority of scientific interpreters, it is still treated as a series of abrupt creations. The classifications of naturalists, from the times of Linnæus and Cuvier, with their serial orders, genera, and species, are simply accepted as so many archetypes or ideals of the Creator, which He has separately produced and realized in fulfillment of a foreordained scheme, terminating in man as the image of God and lord of nature. Professor Owen declared that in the Divine mind the knowledge of such a being as man existed long before man appeared upon the earth. Agassiz, in his Zoölogy, not only denied that the growing resemblance of animal and human species in the Secondary and Tertiary epochs was due to any parental descent from the earlier to the later mammals and reptiles, but maintained that their only connection is to be sought in the view of the Creator Himself, whose aim in successively creating all the different types which have passed away was to introduce man upon our globe, as the end toward which the whole animal creation has tended from the first appearance of the palæozoic fishes. And Hugh Miller, in his "Testimony of the Rocks," declared that Owen and Agassiz, by thus retracing the divine archetypes which preceded the glorious form of man, were but echoing the hymn of the Psalmist, "In Thy book all my members were written, which in continuance were fashioned when as yet there was none of them."

Proceeding upon such scientific views, some fanciful writers have even depicted with scenic effect the creative fiats, by which God called forth plant, bird and beast, and saw that each was good. Schubert daringly describes them as the productions of a creative art, which at every throb of its activity

exulted in beholding the manifold forms of life. Keerl, in his "History of Creation," with still bolder fancy, represents Nature in the process of producing man, as shattering mould after mould, and hiding them away in rocky graves, till she found the finished ideal with which alone she could be satisfied. Schlegel, in his "Philosophy of Life," maintained that poisonous reptiles and other malevolent monsters are not divine creations, but Satanic perversions of the productive energies of nature, and the anthropoid ape especially but a spiteful parody upon the image of God in man. Delitzsch, in his "Genesis," agrees with Ebrard in identifying the catastrophic phenomena of Plutonism as but the volcanic birth throes of the earth, when, at the divine command, it brought forth the mammals of the tertiary epoch, and would thus explain the disarrangement of the fossiliferous strata which preceded the appearance of man. And monstrous as would seem the miracles of a sudden creation of species, did we stop to fancy them, yet the great mass, probably, have still no clearer view than that of Milton in his Paradise Lost:

> "The grassy clods now calv'd; now half appear'd
> The tawny lion, pawing to get free
> His hinder parts, then springs as broke from bonds,
> And rampant shakes his brinded mane."

There is, however, a large and increasing class who are now seeking to blend the whole palæontological series in one continuous creation or creative evolution. When as yet it had been but partially restored and was still broken by long gaps and missing links, the interposition of a Creator seemed necessary at every step; but as these were gradually filled and supplied, and supposed laws of transmutation and descent were suggested, it has become a temptation to admit such laws into the creative process, with other natural laws, as but the expression of the divine wisdom; and by degrees the whole animate creation has been surrendered to their sway. At first only the vegetable and animal kingdoms were conceded to evolutionism. Since Darwin, Hooker and Wallace have been joined by such veteran leaders as Lyell, De Candolle and Asa Gray, and the younger working naturalists have followed them in a body, they have begun to receive

recruits from the ranks of earnest laymen and zealous divines, bringing with them the orthodox standard of creationism into the very thick of the battle. Chancellor Winchell, in his "Doctrine of Evolution," accepts it as the law of the Creator throughout the inorganic world, and possibly also the lower organic kingdom, and believes it to be consistent with the Scriptures as interpreted by many of the greatest divines and theologians. Dr. Brown, of Berwick, as a member of the Evangelical Alliance, in discussing the "Religious Aspects of the Development Hypothesis," claimed it as applicable certainly in the vegetable world and probably in the animal world, and as compatible with the articles of the Westminster Catechism. The Rev. George Henslow, in his Actonian prize essays on "Evolution and Religion," declares that to him it is infinitely more probable that all extinct and living species have been developed by natural laws than that they should have been severally due to creative fiats, though he is not yet prepared to admit that man has been evolved by precisely the same processes as the horse from the palæotherium. St. George Mivart, the distinguished Roman Catholic naturalist, in his work on the "Genesis of Species," holds evolutionism to be consistent with the teachings of Augustine, Aquinas and Suarez, and admits that it is the method of creation throughout living nature, including even the animal frame of man, but for the addition of the human soul requires a new special act of Divine Power. Mr. St. Clair, in a work entitled "Darwinism and Design or Creation by Evolution," makes it his especial aim to show that the theory, so far from being anti-biblical, is a new illustration of the wisdom and beneficence of God throughout His creation, from the birth of the solar system to the origin of moral species. It will be but a step further, to blend evolutionism with creationism in the genesis of the first Adam. Dr. Lange, in his Commentary, hints profoundly that there must have been the highest excitation and effort of the earth in the formation of man as the chief work of creation, and beautifully depicts him in the same moment waked into life and intelligence as by a kiss of divine love. Professor Tayler Lewis, with a still more scientific view, not only rejects the idea of an instantaneous or artificial

creation of man from nothing or from crude matter, as a mere manipulated statue or dead organization; but seeks to trace his formation through the whole previous process of nature, from the lowest up to the highest animal type, with connecting links, until the point was reached where the human species by a special act was constituted in the divine image. And when once the ideas of time, causality and organic process have thus been admitted in this region, it may not be long before the secular evolution of Adam from the animal species shall be claimed to be as scriptural and orthodox as that of the animal from the vegetable races, or that of the organized planet from the inorganic nebula.

The same eclectic spirit is also seeking to blend the new speculative ethnology with the Mosaic tables of genealogy. Until the discovery of the American and Polynesian tribes, it was easy to regard Adam as the father of the whole human family, and Noah as the founder of all existing nations, and even since that discovery the orthodox traditional ethnography has long held its ground. Learned investigators, such as Bochart, Le Clerc, Michaelis, and Sir William Jones, have maintained that the three great continental races of Asia, Africa and Europe, are the decendants of Shem, Ham, and Japhet, the three sons of Noah. And commentors, such as Lowth and Bush, have sought in the subsequent history and present condition of those races a fulfilment of the predictions of Noah to their progenitors; of the blessing upon Shem, in the religious mission of the Shemitic nations of Asia, the founders of Judaism and Christianity; of the benediction upon Japhet,in the great civilizing and colonizing nations of Europe; and of the curse upon Ham, the servant of servants, in the Canaanites who were expelled by the Hebrews, and in the Africans, who were subjugated by the Romans, and have since been enslaved by the English in the American Colonies.

But the difficulty of including all tribes and peoples in this genealogy has combined with theories of the multiple origin of the species to suggest new schemes of reconciliation. Agassiz, reviving the doctrine of Peyrère as an hypothesis, maintained that the truth of both Scripture and science would be conserved by accepting Adam as the head of the Jewish or

Caucasian race, with its three great Shemitic, Hamitic and Japhetic branches in Western Asia, and yet allowing the co-existence of other races created in the same human nature, but not yet brought under the divine economy, such as the inhabitants of Nod, among whom Cain married and built a city. Dr. John Pye Smith, in his "Geology and Scripture," consistently with his idea of a special local creation, cautiously admitted that the proof of a Hamite and pre-Adamite race, if established, would not necessarily be inconsistent with the statement in Acts, that God hath made of one blood all men, since they might have the same psychological structure though created at different geographical centres; nor would it unsettle the doctrine of the first Adam, since he might still serve as a figure of Christ in the new covenant, and the mystery of original sin would remain the same inscrutable fact as upon the other hypothesis. Dr. Dominick McCausland, in his work entitled, "Adam and the Adamite," has endeavored to harmonize Scripture and ethnology, by maintaining that the Book of Genesis refers almost exclusively to the Adamic race, which was created as the last, and not the first, of other pre-Adamite races, known as the African and Patagonian savages of the present day, and which was introduced among them as a new and higher species, made in the divine image and placed under a supernatural dispensation, with a view to the ultimate redemption of all mankind. The anonymous author of "Primeval Man Unveiled, or the Anthropology of the Bible," having maintained in his previous work on "The Stars and the Angels," that the angelic and human natures are the same, now argues that the pre-Adamite remains in different parts of the globe, claimed as denizens of the stone, the bronze, or the iron ages, are but the degenerate bodies of fallen angels, the relics of a Satanic race which once flourished with abortive strength in Central America, and thence bequeathed a diabolic civilization to India and Egypt, when as yet Europe was an abode of primeval savages bearing the same relation to their brethren in Guatemala and Yucatan that the cultivated nations of England and France now bear to the Patagonian and the Hottentot. And thus the wildest dreams of angelology are strangely blending with the latest speculations of the ethnologist.

In the same rash manner, the new discoveries of the archæologist are pressed into union with the biblical chronology and history. For centuries it has been the orthodox belief that the whole human epoch may be included within a period of six thousand years; that after the first two thousand years the entire race, except the family of Noah, was destroyed by the Deluge, and that during the next two thousand years it became scattered over the earth with an ever deteriorating civilization. And a vast amount of learning has been expended in verifying this opinion. Leading chronologers, such as Usher, Hales and Prideaux, have sought to combine the evidence of profane with sacred history at every point of contact. Mythologists, such as Bryant, Faber and Harcourt, have traced the coincidence of Gentile and Jewish, Pagan and Christian traditions, as between Vulcan and Tubal-Cain, Apollo and Jubal, Deucalion and Noah, the Titans and the Babel-builders. And antiquarians, such as Thorowgood, Montezini, Boudinot, President Styles, and a host of others, have endeavored to identify the Aborigines of America as the expelled Canaanites, or the lost tribes of Israel, or wandering Jews who anticipated the discovery of Columbus, or emigrant Tyrians to whom the Apostle Thomas had preached Christianity.

But the alleged discovery of some antediluvian monuments and records in Egypt, Assyria and Central America, and of pre-historic skulls and implements in Denmark, France and England, together with theories of the secular development of the human species, have led to an expansion of the historic era from thousands to millions of years, with corresponding efforts to adjust it to the sacred records. By many, indeed, the old biblical chronology is simply re-affirmed or but slightly extended. Reginald Stuart Poole, in his "Genesis of Man," dates the creation of Adam about the year 5361 B. C., and the Deluge about the year 3099 B. C., and claims that at the epoch of the fourth dynasty in Egypt, 2400 B. C., as high a civilization existed as at any later period. Piazzi Smith, in his works on the Great Pyramid, maintains that it was built about 4000 years ago, by the descendants of Noah, under divine inspiration, as a meteorological and astronomical monu-

ment, expressing in its position, size, weight and temperature more scientific knowledge than is possessed at the present day; that the other pyramids, cromlechs and mounds of Asia, Europe and America are but debased imitations of a later date; and that the stone, bronze and iron epochs of the archæologist are simply co-existent rather than successive stages of barbarism and civilization, now occurring in different parts of the earth. Mr. James C. Southall of Richmond, in his learned treatise on the "Recent Origin of Man," also discards the chronometry of the chipped flints and bone implements, and finds the beginnings of all civilization within 2700, or at most 4000 years B. C., in the industrial arts of Tubal-Cain, the fine arts of Jubal, and the cities of Nod and Enoch, as renewed after the Flood among the Egyptians, Chinese and Assyrians.

By another growing class, however, the old biblical chronology has already been largely expanded or virtually abandoned. Bunsen claims that there is no chronological element in Genesis. Dr. Hodge, as if anticipating such a result, admits that the Scriptures do not teach us how long men have existed on the earth, their tables of genealogy being simply intended to prove that Christ was the son of David and of the seed of Abraham. Dr. William H. Green, in his "Pentateuch Vindicated," explains that the sacred registers, consistently with their design, do not include all the generations or births in a given line, and that, in some cases, a single progenitor is said to have begotten several whole nations, the Jebusite, the Amorite, the Girgasite, and the Hivite. It has also been suggested that the names of the patriarchs may represent not only individual progenitors but successive dynasties, or leading families, lasting through long periods, like the Saxon and Norman successions, or the houses of York, Lancaster, Stuart and Hanover. And other writers, accepting the pre-Adamite view, find ample space outside of the Jewish or Caucasian genealogy, for the oldest monuments of pre-historic barbarism and non-Adamic civilization. McCausland, though he refers the ruins of Egypt and Mexico alike to a Hamitic race of Babel-builders long since extinct, argues that a prediluvian civilization was founded by Jubal and Tubal-Cain in

Central Asia, and thence flowed eastward, with the exiled Cain among the pre-Adamite savages of China, where it still lingers, stagnated by the Mongolian blood. The author of "Primeval Man Unveiled" conjectured that the ruins of Central America indicate a pre-Adamic and Satanic civilization, whose Eden could be followed by no Calvary, and whose Tubal-Cains and Jubals flourished as the founders of arts and sciences, without a Seth or a Noah to save them from hopeless degeneracy. The same writer agrees with Miss Frances Rolleston, the author of "Mazzaroth," in finding remnants of an antediluvian theology in the constellations, such as the Virgin, the Scorpion, the Centaur, the Goat, which the patriarchs are supposed to have invented and used as prophetic types of the promised Messiah, the conflict with Satan, the incarnation, and the atonement.

The sacred philologist is also seeking prematurely for a biblical theory of languages as well as races. It has been held by the rabbins, the fathers, the schoolmen and the reformers, that the Hebrew tongue was divinely taught to Adam in Paradise when he gave names to the animals, and thenceforward continued the one, universal language after the Deluge, while the whole earth was still of one speech. And notwithstanding the endless diversities in structure and etymology which now prevail, many leading linguists, on the theory of a common origin of languages as held by Latham and Max Müller, have been striving with immense learning and ingenuity to trace back all existing dialects, through the inflexional, agglutinate and monosyllabic stages, to the one primitive tongue of Adam and Noah. Arthur James Johnes was countenanced by Prichard in an effort thus to collect the philological proofs of the original unity and recent origin of the human race. Bunsen, in his "Philosophy of Universal History as applied to Language and Religion," has argued that the high inflexional languages of Europe and Asia are of the same stock; that the agglutinate tongues of America and Polynesia are scions of the Asiatic; and that the monosyllabic Chinese is the oldest monument of the original pre-diluvian speech, borne away before the flood to the high table-land of Mongolia or land of Nod, in which Cain settled. The Rev. Joseph Edkins, of

the Ningpo Mission, in his work entitled "China's Place in Philology," maintains that the Chinese are descendants of Ham, who migrated eastward after the Deluge, and that their language is a relic of the primitive monosyllabic tongue of Adam and Noah, akin not only to the Hebrew and the Greek, but even the English, in roots, syntax and inflexional growth. Mr. Lewis Morgan, in his elaborate Smithsonian treatise on "Systems of Consanguinity," has projected a scheme of philological and genealogical inquiries in reference to the North American tribes, which Principal Dawson claims as affording proof that even civilized nations have descended from the Biblical Adam and Eve, through consanguineous marriages, to the present domestic and social refinement. But the difficulty of compressing the enormous growth of so many races and languages within the received chronology, combined with theories of their plural origin as advanced by Steinthal and Schleicher, has led some devout scientists and divines, like Agassiz and McCausland, to treat the rude inorganic tongues of China, America and Polynesia, as separate products of pre-Adamite races, among whom Cain was exiled, while the more refined and highly organized languages of the Caucasian or Adamic race are claimed as relics of the divine paradisaic speech, which the great confusion at Babel has only broken into brilliant dialects, the still jarring echoes of a primeval harmony.

The great miracles wrought for the human race under both dispensations, have also ever been claimed as true divine interpositions, admitting of a scientific verification. It was maintained by Bryant and Harcourt, that the ark which saved the second father of mankind still figures in the traditions of all nations; and its stowage was elaborately calculated by Bishop Wilkins and Sir Walter Raleigh, who proved that it could receive in its three stories Noah and his sons, with their families and provisions for their maintenance, pairs of all the domestic animals, with an adequate supply of fruits, vegetables fodder, and 1,825 sheep as food for the beasts of prey. The tower of Babel was identified among the ruins of Babylon, and the great confusion and dispersion still attested by the existing jargon of languages and conflict of nations. The Messianic

prophecies were corroborated by a concurrent Gentile tradition as seen in the visit of Balaam and the Magi of the East. The incarnation also had its dim caricature or presentiment in the avatars of the Hindoo and the theogonies of the Greek. According to many writers, the cures of the sick, blind and lame, were genuine miracles of love and power, which were not restricted to the Apostles, but afterwards repeated by saints and martyrs, and are to this day possible, according to promise, in answer to the prayer of faith. The transfiguration, resurrection, and ascension of Christ, simply anticipated and exemplified that glorious humanity which is yet to appear on the scene of the renewed earth as the Second Adam of another paradise. Even the animal creation, it is conjectured, will share in the redemption as it has also shared in the apostacy. Dr. Kirby could conjecture that there were no carnivorous beasts in Eden. Professor Goldwin Smith has suggested that man himself, as he becomes civilized, grows less carnivorous and more kindly in his relations to the brute creation; that the animal races so participate in his progress that the tame predominate over the wild species, and that their powers of domestication and education are on the increase. Hosts of divines, poets and philosophers, have also held with Bishop Butler, that animals may be immortal and play some important part in the perfected human system. And if the civilized dog, as compared with his wolfish ancestor, be taken for a harbinger of such a millennium, it might seem but the natural growth and miraculous flower of organic nature, for the wolf to dwell with the lamb, the leopard with the kid, the calf with the young lion, and a little child to lead them.

The physical sciences, as thus traversed by the eclectic spirit, have been filled with the exploits of a daring faith, as brilliant, but often as useless, as the mere pastime of a tournament.

Surveying next the psychical sciences, we shall there behold elaborate systems of blended thought and faith, which for centuries have served as the strong-holds of orthodoxy, but seem now becoming like moss-grown fortifications, made useless by a change of base and of tactics. In contrast with

the devout speculations which we have traced in the physical sciences, these more sacred tenets are still claimed as the doctrines of Scripture, as well as true theories of science; and it is only now and then that a few religious eclectics have been rash enough to abandon them for any new scientific opinions that have been broached in their place.

Eclecticism in Psychology.

The whole scientific psychology has thus been long held and defended as a purely theological province. Owing to the imperfect state of the sciences of logic, ethics and æsthetics, the crudest notions were blended with biblical teachings by the rabbins, fathers, schoolmen and reformers. The different mental and moral faculties were metaphorically treated as functions of the reins, the bowels, the heart, as well as of the external senses and members, and as such requiring to be cleansed, remedied and renewed by divine grace. The dual and triple constitution of body, soul and spirit was based in Scripture as reflected by the two-fold nature of Christ and the Trinity of Divine Persons. And even the later biblical psychology does not seem to have advanced very far beyond the traditional and popular stand-point. Bunyan depicted it allegorically in his "Holy War" by representing the whole Christian life as a conflict of infernal and supernal powers for the possession of the city of Man-soul with its eye-gate, ear-gate, and mouth-gate and its various personified thoughts, passions and faculties. Dr. George Combe, with less of metaphor, has endeavored to reconcile the psychical map of phrenology with the claims of orthodoxy. Coleridge even sought for the Kantian distinction between the understanding and the reason in that between the mind of the flesh and the spirit as defined by St. Paul. Delitzsch still finds the ancient trichotomy, or triple human constitution, in the creation of man as a living soul resulting from the union of body and spirit. And now and then faulty arguments for the divine benevolence are built upon ethical and æsthetical theories which do not stand the strictest tests of mental science, as when the imagination and the conscience are treated as susceptible to beauty and goodness, and not also to deformity and sin.

If the psychological sciences had become more exact their fusion with biblical doctrines might be more obvious and hurtful. But happily in the realm of consciousness the religious sentiments can thrive without a scientific knowledge of their own process. The Religious Affections as traced by Jonathan Edwards are not criticised, like his treatise on the Will; we care not to ask if his views of repentance and faith will accord with the laws of mental and moral phenomena. Even though the utmost certitude had been reached in the delineation of our conscious powers, it could only blend devout praise with that panegyric wrung from tragedy itself when on the verge of madness:

> "What a piece of work is man! How noble in reason!
> How infinite in faculty! in form and moving,
> How express and admirable! in action, how like
> An angel! in apprehension, how like a God!"

But no sooner do we pass beyond the empirical psychology into other more speculative regions than we find the crudest eclecticism still prevailing, in regard to such questions as the origin and destiny of the soul. The traditional dogmas concerning the creation and propagation of the human spirit have simply been re-defined on new psychological principles. Even the doctrine of a pre-existence of all souls in God, originally based, by Origen and Philo, upon the Platonic sentiment of reminiscence of a former state, and since renewed by Henry More, has appeared in the schools of Kant, Schelling and Schubert, who endeavored to explain the origin of evil by a sort of previous probation and metempsychosis. The younger Fichte denies that the divine image could descend by generation, from father to son. Julius Müller, in his "Christian Doctrine of Sin," maintains that pre-existent souls for a former apostacy have been imprisoned in human bodies. Dr. Edward Beecher published a treatise entitled the "Conflict of Ages," in which by the same theory he essayed to settle the whole controversy as to the origin of evil and the fall of man. And Wordsworth, in his noblest poem, "The Intimations of Immortality in the Recollections of Childhood," has expressed the doctrine of divine emanation and reminiscence in lines which will endure as long as the language:

"Our birth is but a sleep and a forgetting:
The soul that rises with us, our life's star,
Hath had elsewhere its setting,
And cometh from afar.
Not in entire forgetfulness,
And not in utter nakedness,
But trailing clouds of glory do we come
From God, who is our home."

Creationism also, as held by Lactantius and Aquinas and re-defined by Calvin, is still retained on the basis of the Cartesian definition of the soul as a spiritual substance directly created and infused in the human organism before birth by the Father of Spirits in distinction from the fathers of our flesh. Dr. Hodge, agreeing with the Augustinian view, describes such a creation as a special act of divine power, mysterious, yet not miraculous, like the creation of physical life in a seed or an embryo; and holds that it is the only doctrine consistent with the immateriality of the soul and the sinlessness of Christ. The Rev. J. B. Heard, in his "Tripartite Nature of Man," whilst admitting that the body and the soul are propagated under natural laws, as may be seen in the hereditary genius of the Sheridans, Coleridges and Herschels, maintains that a third principle, the spirit, pneuma or conscience, is created, regenerated and made immortal as the basis of consciousness in the intermediate state and the chief attribute of the spiritual body in the resurection. Dr. Martensen, in his Dogmatic, inclines to a modified creationism which would admit the immediate action of God as to the production of the soul, while it conserves what is true in the rival doctrine, as to a propagation of the animal life. Günther and Lange take similar views. But the most pronounced traducianism of Tertullian and Luther is likewise finding advocates as a rational explanation, not only of the doctrine of hereditary depravity, but of such psychological phenomena as the likeness of parent and child in soul as well as body, and the transmission of moral and intellectual traits no less than physical features. Delitzsch, holding to a sort of ideal pre-existence of all souls in the divine mind from the beginning, declares that any new creative energy at their birth would be inconsistent with the rest or Sabbath of the Creation during

this age of the world, as well as with the facts of psychology. Professor Frohschammer, of Munich, in his work on the "Origin of the Soul," defines traducianism as a secondary creation by the creature, and terms it generationism. And Dr. Krauth, in his "Conservative Reformation," with remarkable clearness and precision has maintained that the soul is no more immediately created than the body, that the one, as the other, is only created through the parents as the divinely ordained organ of its production, that the spiritual likeness of child and father is obvious and intimate, and that therein is mirrored the inscrutable mystery of the eternal generation of the divine Son by the Absolute Spirit. There is, however, a grosser traducianism which seems likely to return in connection with the new, materialistic speculations of our day, somewhat like the paradoxical attempt of a forgotten school of English divines in the last century, such as Hills, Woolner and Dodwell, who strove to base the notion of a material origin of the soul in Scripture as well as reason. Already Mr. Jonathan Langstaff Forster, in his "Biblical Psychology," has maintained that the existence of the soul as a distinct personal entity is a Platonic rather than a Scriptural doctrine, and the mere relic of a heathen psychology. And such views have even been associated with the doctrine concerning the derivation of the human nature of Christ. It will not be surprising if the latest evolutionary psychology of Spencer, Maudsley and Chauncey Wright shall yet find some advanced divines to champion it as the implicit teaching of Scripture.

In the same manner, the theory of the will or doctrine of human conduct, still continues a fruitful theme of devout speculation. Every dogmatic system of divine grace turns upon the view taken of the active powers of the soul; and the rival schools of libertarianism and necessitarianism, as we have seen, have yielded corresponding dogmas concerning predestination, regeneration and responsibility. English divines of the former school, such as Cudworth, More and Howe, in their controversies with Hobbes and Spinoza, and at a later period Samuel Clarke and Price in their discussion with Leibnitz and Priestley, consistently with the hypothesis of free-will,

maintained that human actions are simply foreknown, not foreordained by God; that the soul is renewed through its own agency; and that moral accountability is measured by ability and opportunity. And the same psychological dogmas have since been re-defined with still more acuteness by American divines, such as Whedon, Taylor, Beecher, and Finney who, in opposition to Edwards and the Princeton Essayists, have held that the divine pre-ordination is contingent upon human free-will; that self-determination and full ability are essential to moral agency; and that regeneration is but a change of purpose or a moral choice between good and evil. The necessitarian school of divines, meanwhile, from their opposite premises have been inculcating the absolute foreordination of human acts, the passivity of the soul in regeneration, and the total moral inability of the sinner in all gracious works. After Arnold Geulincx, as the Calvinistic expounder of Descartes, by his theory of occasional causes, had reduced the soul to a mere pre-determined automaton, and after Jonathan Edwards, as the Calvinistic critic of Collins, had effaced the last vestiges of its self-determining will, it only remained for a school of American Calvinists to push such necessitarian doctrines to their logical extreme. Dr. Nathaniel Emmons, as if to blend and intensify the views of Geulincx and Edwards, maintained that the Spirit of God, so far from implanting any new principle, faculty or disposition in the soul, directly creates or produces the entire series of voluntary acts and holy exercises manifested in its regeneration, conversion and sanctification. Dr. John Smalley, of the same school, with his subtle distinction between natural and moral ability, ingeniously argued that, though man is naturally qualified to obey the will of God, yet he is morally so indisposed as to be wholly unable to think and do right, and that this indisposition is his worst, most inexcusable sin. Dr. Robert Sandeman, with fearless consistency, then proceeded to the legitimate conclusion that all the acts of unregenerate men are an abomination to God, and that the very exhortation to faith and repentance in their case must be unwarranted and of no avail. And ever since, as the fruit of such teachings, there have been pious souls tormented with the dread that after their purest and best

efforts, they were but reprobate and unpardonable sinners for whom it was vain to pray.

And now, scarcely have these traditional controversies of theologians begun to wane, when we behold the same perennial battle renewed where it has ever originated, on the scientific field between new psychological parties. While Dr. Maudsley, in his treatise on "Responsibility in Mental Disease," is rhetorically enforcing necessitarianism with apt Scripture texts and allusions, and Professor Huxley is ironically supporting his human automatism with the orthodoxy of Jonathan Edwards, we find Dr. Elam, with his "Winds of Doctrine," assailing such opinions as mere materialistic fatalism; and Dr. Carpenter, in his "Mental Physiology," denying that the self-determining will can be merged in mere physical causation; that uniform laws can absolve from responsibility, and the moral emotions be measured with muscular forces or molecular movements. And it will be strange indeed, if the clerical spectators who are watching this professional duel, shall not soon take sides and begin to proclaim some fresh Arminian or Calvinistic triumph.

At the same time, the corresponding ethical schools of utilitarianism and asceticism are still contending as of yore for a scriptural foothold. The whole doctrine of human duty and character must ever be pre-determined by psychological views of the moral faculty or quality, and though such views may exist independently of revelation, yet as a historical fact, they have largely had their root or their flower in the ethics of the Bible. And especially since the Greek and Roman and Gothic virtues became blended with the Christian, have attempts been made not only by the fathers, schoolmen and reformers, but also later divines, such as Mosheim, Butler, and Edwards to connect their different moral systems with the Scriptures. On the one side, the Christian asceticism which would make virtue or holiness the sole good, as variously explained by More, Cudworth and Clarke, by Schleiermacher, De Wette and Rothe, has been renewed by Archibald Alexander, Wayland and Haven. On the other side, the Christian utilitarianism which would make happiness or blessedness the sole good, as advocated in different forms by

Malebranche, Steinbart, Paley and Edwards, has reappeared in the moral theology of Hopkins, Taylor and Finney. And while later biblical moralists, such as Martensen, Wutke and Gregory have been endeavoring to reconstruct the whole system of Christian ethics on a scriptural basis, the purely scientific moralists, such as Grote, Sidgwick and Sully, are exploring anew the psychological foundations of all ethical action. Indeed, it would seem that those foundations themselves are to be uptorn and rebuilt from new as well as old materials. In a "Modern Symposium" reported by the Nineteenth Century Review, it has been openly discussed by Sir James Stephen, Dr. Martineau and Professors Harrison and Clifford on the affirmative, and by Lord Selborne, the Duke of Argyll and Dean Stanley on the negative, Whether morality can flourish independently of religion and the Christian virtues remain after a decline of the Christian Faith. It is but the old question of faith and works, returning under a scientific guise; and we may expect to see the controversy extending from the outposts to the very citadel of Christian ethics. If on the one side some new disciples of Cudworth are ready to declare that they would rather be condemned to the place of the lost than admit that the mere will of God must be essentially right and the ground of all moral obligation, we need not wonder to hear from the other side some new Hopkinsian advocate of disinterested benevolence, declaring it the height of Christian virtue to be willing to suffer eternal perdition for the glory of God.

But the destiny of the soul, even more than its origin and conduct, still engages the devout fancy of speculative divines. The dogmas of immortality, the intermediate state, and the final resurrection are maintained with new scientific as well as scriptural arguments, and as philosophical tenets no less than revealed truths. On the one side stands the school of spiritualistic immortalism as the ancient fortress of orthodoxy. Henry More and Norris, Bates and Baxter, Whitby, Stillingfleet and Sherlock, Clarke and Butler, have modern successors in maintaining the immediate survival of the soul after death, as a separate spiritual substance, indissoluble and immortal, conscious and active, entranced in beatific vision or writhing in

remorseful torment. Wolff and Meier and Crusius, are followed by living divines in associating the same doctrine with the Leibnitzian definition of the soul as a spiritual monad, simple, indestructible, and godlike, and in defending it with moral proofs from the divine attributes and the analogy of nature. Devout scientists, such as Wagner, in his treatise on the "Future Condition of Souls," and Tait and Balfour, with their doctrine of the Invisible Universe, are seeking to identify the substance of the soul with the all-pervading ether as the true basis and guarantee of its spirituality, immortality, and participation in things unseen and eternal. Leading dogmatists also have been reconstructing or reaffirming their several eschatologies in the light of the most recent mental and moral science. Dr. Hodge has maintained that the full perfection of the soul in holiness at death, and its immediate entrance into a glory to be completed in the resurrection, are required by the doctrines of probation, justification and redemption, as well as by the implicit psychology of the Scriptures, which assume the independent subsistence, consciousness and activity of the disembodied spirit. Dr. James Alexander, in his Consolatory Discourses, has carefully distinguished the scriptural sleep of the dead from the classic conceit of an oblivious slumber, by maintaining the ceaseless activity, elasticity and independence of the mind, and by showing that death, like sleep, is but a detaching of the soul from the bonds of sense, and a resting from the cares and labors of life, during the night of the grave, until the morning of the resurrection, with still conscious peace and joy. And it might be added, that in that ecstatic slumber of the saints, their spiritual powers may be only liberated and expanded (even as fancy is often busiest in the natural sleep), but under such rational and moral control that, instead of evolving "the stuff that dreams are made of," their ideas ever correspond to pure realities, their images are of things unseen and eternal, and their trance is the beatific vision of heavenly glories. Many practical and consolatory writers, such as Lange, in his "Land of Glory," Harbaugh, in his works on the "Sainted Dead," the "Heavenly Recognition," the "Heavenly Home," and Macdonald, in his treatise entitled "My Father's House," have

been illustrating anew the traditional popular doctrine in the blended light of astronomy and psychology and with all the aids of history and literature.

The Andover "New Theology" has revived the old doctrine of a second probation for the heathen, but on more ethical grounds. Some Anglican divines, from like premises, have surmised that Christians may also improve in holiness after death during the middle state before the final judgment. Dr. Pusey, in an Earnest Remonstrance against the Roman invention of purgatory, argues that the primitive custom of praying for apostles, martyrs, and sainted friends, if now intelligently practised, would not imply any unrest or suffering in their present condition, but only the augmentation and final consummation of their bliss, both in body and soul, at the general resurrection in the last day. Keble, in one of his poems, beautifully describes his sainted mother as receiving new joy from the knowledge of his growth in piety, but somehow spared the sight of his wretchedness in times of passion and sin:

> "Thou turnest not thine eyes below,
> Or clouds of glory beam between,
> Lest earthly pangs of fear or woe
> Upon an angel's brow be seen."

But Cardinal Wiseman, in his Lecture on Purgatory, softening somewhat the rigors of the mediæval dogma, maintains from tradition rather than Scripture, that souls who die in unforgiven sin must be purged and prepared for the divine glory through the pains of the separate state and at length saved as by fire in consequence of the prayers, alms, penances and masses of the faithful on earth, while eminent saints and sinners will immediately enter heaven and hell without waiting for the final judgment. The great epics of Dante and Milton, based upon the extremes of Catholic and Protestant doctrine, have been worthily supplemented in our own day by the Rev. W. W. Lord, whose poem, the "Christ in Hades," represents the intermediate teaching of the primitive church and the early English divines, and depicts the under-world of Paradise with a sustained grandeur of conception and style.

At the same time, speculative divines of the German ideal-

istic school, such as Göschel and Weisse, sublimating the whole Christian doctrine of the future state into vague esoteric abstractions, would consign the wicked mass literally to everlasting death as mere refuse of the Absolute Reason, while a privileged few may attain to eternal life through their participation in the development of the divine consciousness and in the immortality of the human race. Against such vague and unsweet faith, Tennyson would seem to have uttered the protest of all united souls, who seek

> "Upon the last and sharpest height,
> Before the spirits fade away,
> Some landing-place, to clasp and say:
> 'Farewell! we lose ourselves in light!'"

On the other side, however, still stands the school of materialistic mortalism, sending occasional recruits from the very camp of heterodoxy. The controversy waged in all ages of the Church, whether the immortality of the soul can be fully proved without the aid of revelation, has now and then driven eccentric divines to the extreme of denying that it is in the Bible at all, and displacing it as a mere Platonic tradition with some psychological doctrine, long since classed among the paradoxes of a devout fancy. At first they distinguished between the mere unconsciousness and the absolute extinction of the soul. The psycho-pannychists of the Reformation, as we have seen, simply recoiled from the purgatory and paradise of Romanism toward the opposite view of an unconscious slumber of the disembodied spirit during the intermediate state. Luther, though certainly not a materialist, was inclined to believe that the souls of the just sleep till the day of judgment, as he declared of the Elector who had died on returning from a chase, that in the resurrection it would seem to him as if he had just come from the forests where he had been hunting, and that the heavenly recognition of the saints would be like that of Adam and Eve on his awaking from the trance during which she had been formed from his side. Tyndal, the martyred translator of the Bible, in controverting papal error, used some expressions which imply the insensibility as well as disembodied state of departed souls; but confessed his entire ignorance of their condition, and

emphasized the resurrection and second coming of Christ as more important and hourly impending events. Socinus held that the separate soul was rapt in mere contemplative self-consciousness, without any sensation or perception of external reality. Archbishop Whately, in his "Revelations of the Future State," after balancing the arguments on both sides, favored the notion of an unconscious interval between death and resurrection as more in accordance with the Scriptural analogy of sleep, and practically ensuring an instantaneous entrance into heaven. Bishop Butler has suggested that such a temporary suspension of reason, memory and affection, as we know from sleep or a swoon, would not involve their destruction. And Tennyson has also sought for the consolation of future recognition in the same conjecture:

> "If Sleep and Death be truly one,
> And every spirit's folded bloom
> Through all its intervital gloom
> In some long trance should slumber on;
>
> Unconscious of the sliding hour,
> Bare of the body, might it last,
> And silent traces of the past
> Be all the color of the flower.
>
> And love would last as pure and whole
> As when he loved me here in time,
> And at the spiritual prime
> Rewaken with the dawning soul."

It was beautifully said by Chrysostom that the early Christians called the place of burial a cemetery or dormitory, to teach us that departed souls are not dead, but have only lain down to sleep. And Bryant, in his Thanatopsis, has likened the dying saint to one

> "Who wraps the drapery of his couch
> About him, and lies down to pleasant dreams."

But a few extreme divines, abandoning Plato for Aristotle, and connecting materialistic arguments with unusual interpretations of Scripture, have gone the length of denying the existence as well as the consciousness of the disembodied soul, on the ground that the spirit dies with the body, of which it is but a function, through which alone it can be exercised, and with which therefore it must be revived in the final resurrec-

tion. The classic myth of Endymion, who for craving the boon of immortality was condemned to perpetual slumber in the cave of oblivion on Mt. Latmus, has been renewed in a Christian form, and the sleep of the sainted dead converted into a dreamless stupor not distinguishable from annihilation. M. Charles de Rémusat, in his history of philosophy, has recalled various forgotten writers of the seventeenth century, who endeavored to prove that the whole man is mortal, that the true immortality begins at the resurrection, and that there is no intermediate paradise or purgatory, heaven or hell, before the final judgment. Some English divines of the last century joined the materialists, Coward, Layton and Collins, in maintaining the natural mortality of the soul as a positive tenet of Scripture no less than a truth of psychology. Dr. Henry Dodwell, a non-juring churchman deprived of his chair at Oxford, published several works in which he labored with great learning and ingenuity to prove from the Holy Scriptures and the early fathers, that the soul is a principle naturally mortal, but immortalized actually by the pleasure of God, to punishment or to reward, through its union with the divine Spirit in baptism, and that none have the power of giving this immortality since the Apostles but only the Bishops. Joseph Pitts defended the position of Dodwell in various treatises, maintaining that immortality is not a natural ingredient of spirit, that it is preternatural to human souls and a divine gift of the Holy Ghost, secured by Christ, who hath abolished death and brought life and immortality to light. At a later period Priestley, in his "Disquisitions on Matter and Spirit," not only held the sleep of the whole man till the resurrection to be the genuine Christian doctrine, but argued that it made the soul as much dead as the body, and was only another and softer name for the same thing. While such writers have associated mortalism with Unitarianism and Episcopacy, it has been reserved for the Rev. John Miller to revive the same opinion in an able treatise, at the chief seat of Presbyterian orthodoxy. Even the Aristotelian notion of the Italian materialists would seem to have re-appeared in some recent German divines, who hold that the individual soul, being inseparable from the bodily organization, must vanish into the

universal soul, during the time between death and the resurrection, the dust returning to the earth as it was and the spirit unto God who gave it. It will only repeat the cycle of former errors if Feuerbach and Büchner should yet be made to interpret David and St. Paul. Solomon in some of his ironical passages might easily be cited as an Epicurean. Already Lucretius and Seneca have appeared among the comforters of Job, preaching a stoical faith which would bid the mourner bury his heart in the grave at which he weeps. And our whole elegiac literature abounds in Pagan emblems which would change the euthanasia of the saint into a Lethean slumber, and make the Christian cemetery a literal dormitory of the soul as well as the body.

While mortalists and immortalists differ thus widely in regard to the intermediate state, many of both schools are practically united in their views of the resurrection, as a biblical doctrine susceptible of scientific support and illustration. It is maintained that the notions of a bodily restoration among the Hindoos, the Egyptians and the Persians, are traditions of a revealed truth which is prefigured in the Old Testament and completed in the New, and which meets a universal presentiment expressed in the sepulchral rites and emblems and monuments of all nations. And attempts are made to render it conceivable and probable in the blended light of physiology and psychology. Some writers, anticipating a resurrection at the moment of death, seek a basis for it in the present constitution. Swedenborg in his Celestial Arcana, Bonnet in his Palingenesia, and George Bush in his Anastasis, have maintained that there is a spiritual body ensheathed in the present material body, and liberated in the very process of dissolution with an unbroken continuity of life, but with a new organization resembling the old, or as unlike as the butterfly is unlike the worm. Isaac Taylor, in his Physical Theory of Another Life, pursuing some conjectures of Butler, has ingeniously argued that in man as the chief terrestrial animal may be discerned the prophetic instincts and latent types of an expected metamorphosis as plainly as in the structure and habits of an insect preparing to pass into the chrysalis state; that at death by a transition as natural as birth his rational and moral

consciousness will at once expand into a new, refined corporeity, affording larger scope for those intense emotions which are now repressed by the limited capacity of the nervous system; and that at length he will obtain that full measure of physical energy and expression which will enable him to sustain the otherwise overpowering impressions of the beatific vision. Julius Müller holds that, though the spirit lives, its organizing principle remains dormant between death and resurrection, until it shall be clothed with its house from heaven. But Lange, in his "Doctrine of the Last Things," would seem to advocate a sort of continuous or successive incarnation of the soul by virtue of a plastic or formative force which impels it to incorporate itself suitably in all circumstances, as a seed assimilates and vitalizes surrounding matter, enabling it at birth to fashion for itself the present organism, then after death to assume some more ethereal vehicle, and at length, in the great palingenesia, to clothe itself in the most glorious form which the universe can afford, some refined radiant structure, which shall be freed from all earthly vileness, and in which the righteous shall shine as the stars forever.

The most varied conjectures have also prevailed as to the sameness of the future with the present body. The older and more general opinion is, that the whole or a part of the very same matter or substance will be revived. The fathers seem to have looked for a literal resuscitation of the entire body with all its bones, flesh and blood, as deposited in the grave. The schoolmen, with more moderation, taught that only the body in the maturity of its vigor and beauty will be raised. The rabbins fancied a rudiment of the resurrection at the extremity of what is known to anatomists as the sacred bone, and its contact in the grave with some portion of the holy soil of Palestine is still supposed to be necessary to secure its future germination and prevent a subterranean migration to the Holy Land. The Rev. Samuel Drew, in his treatise on the identity of the resurrection body, has revived this conceit in a more refined form by maintaining that there is in every human organism an indestructible germ which, as the flower from the seed, shall ripen thousands of years after it has been sown in the ground. Bishop Butler has hinted

that from all we know of the present body and of the ultimate constitution of matter, the merest infinitesimal atom might afford the sufficient nucleus of a new organization. But the popular conception of the general resurrection is probably that depicted by the poet Young:

> "Now charnels rattle; scattered limbs and all
> The various bones, obsequious to the call,
> Self-moved advance,—the neck perhaps to meet
> The distant head; the distant head, the feet."

Another opinion is, that the organization only may be the same, even though the substance or matter should be wholly different. It has been shown by psychologists and physiologists that personal identity is maintained in the present body whilst its existing particles are constantly replaced by other particles every seven, ten, or twenty years. President Hitchcock therefore suggests that it is not necessary to assume a single restored particle in the resurrection body, but only similar particles united, so as to assume the same structure and form. And if the soul itself, as many have fancied, be endowed with plastic as well as percipient powers, by which it unconsciously moulds and sustains the whole organism, then it may hereafter, at the signal of the resurrection, appropriate and vitalize entirely new matter in a body exactly like that which it long ago shed and lost in the grave. But still another and yet more subtle opinion is, that the identity may be neither substantial, nor organic, but simply ideal, like that which belongs to a work of art. The Apollo Belvidere would be in this sense the same, though wrought in other marble. The rainbow is the same in the driving shower. And the identification of the human body is secured simply through its expression of the same character, so that shrewd observers can discern not merely personal and family traits, but national and even provincial ideas. We assure ourselves of the individuality which it reveals without any recondite regard to its material particles or its mode of organic life. The poet Shelley thus depicts the soul of sleeping Ianthe as it stood,

> All beautiful in naked purity,
> The perfect semblance of its bodily frame,
> Instinct with inexpressible beauty and grace;

while the body lay upon the couch, with the animal life perfect, and every organ performing its natural functions. Dr. Hodge has suggested that if the soul now have so much power to illuminate and render intelligible the gross material of the body, it may hereafter make its ethereal vestment so expressive of itself, that we shall at once recognize Isaiah, Paul and John. And if the conjecture of Lange be added, it might still retain its identity, though it were endowed with an unlimited capacity for organizing and expressing itself in material forms, and should acquire other physical perceptions and powers, as unlike those of this vile body, this muddy vesture of decay, as is the beautiful insect unlike the unsightly chrysalis out of which it struggled up into a new sphere, with new organs and a new life.

The psychical miracles of Scripture have also been subjected to the same eclectic treatment. It has been claimed that the gifts of inspiration, of prophecy, and of tongues were genuine manifestations of the Holy Spirit, which have recurred in the Church at different times, as lately among the Irvingites, and may even be corroborated by analogous phenomena of Satanic origin in the secular sphere. Volumes have been written to prove that the demoniacs in the Gospels were not only genuine possessions of evil spirits, but have ever since been paralleled by cases of witchcraft and sorcery, requiring forms of exorcism and torture. Dr. Carpenter, in a recent review of mesmerism, clairvoyance, spirit-rapping, etc., has incisively remarked that we are now asked to believe greater psychical miracles in the name of science, than have hitherto been claimed in the name of religion. Isaac Taylor has profoundly hinted that frequent communion with departed spirits may be hindered not only by their lack of our modes of communication, but by our inadequate nervous capacity to long sustain their spiritual influences and impressions. And in spite of all the superstitious angel-worship of past ages and the vulgar necromancy of the present day, there are those who can still believe with St. Paul in a permitted ministry of angels and sainted friends.

Eclecticism in Sociology.

The scientific sociology may be said to have been hitherto held by a religious eclecticism with almost undisputed sway. Political economy, civil government, and philosophical history, until fully matured, were simply treated as ecclesiastical topics. And ever since they became independent, devout statesmen, as well as intelligent churchmen, have continued to find their respective systems of polity precisely delineated in Holy Scripture as at once the models of divine wisdom and the ideals of social science. A papal, prelatical, or presbyterial theocracy has been discerned by Bellarmin, Laud and Calderwood, in the Jewish and Christian Church; an absolute monarchy, by Bossuet and Filmer, in the anointed kings of Judah, from David to the Messiah; a legitimate aristocracy by Southern divines, in the patriarchal institution of domestic slavery; and a foreordained democracy, by Northern preachers, in the exodus of the pilgrim fathers from European bondage, the expulsion of the Canaanitish aborigines, and the establishment of the thirteen colonies, like the ancient tribes of Israel, under a model government, with a mighty and outstretched arm in the view of all nations. And at the same time, Christian economists and philanthropists, such as Grotius and Malthus, have been seeking proofs of the divine wisdom and goodness in a supposed natural constitution of society which would simply perpetuate war, caste, poverty, ignorance and crime, as chronic and remediless evils of human nature.

In the speculative realms of social science the eclectic spirit is still charging the most opposite opinions with biblical meaning and dogmatic prejudice. The rival schools of thought as to the origin, development and destiny of society are alike led by Christian writers to their extreme results in theory and practice; and on both sides appear zealous claimants for a Christian politic or a Christian economic or a Christian philosophy of history which is held to be at once scriptural and scientific.

On the one side a strict legitimism is retained by such faithful adherents of the papacy as Father Newman and Cardinal Manning who maintain the temporal independence or supremacy of the Roman Pontiff as essential to his spiritual pre-

rogatives, and accept his decrees as but the historical and logical outgrowth of an infallible hierarchy; by such zealous churchmen as Palmer, Hopkins and Miller, who have held the divine right of bishops or of presbyters to be in accordance with apostolic teaching and example, as well as with the principles of Christian society; and by loyal followers of exiled monarchs, who imagine them sovereigns by the grace of God and the will of the people, no less than guarantees of order and virtue.

The exclusively Providential view of the whole human development has been carried to a climax by the Rev. James Smith in a "Divine Drama of History," of which the classical five-fold play is to be taken as the analogue, and for which physical geography furnishes the stage and scenery, chronology the successive acts, and nations and civilizations the performing personages, while the vast plot of the world's redemption is being unfolded. The Chevalier Bunsen has more philosophically, if not pantheistically, advocated such a conception in his treatise "God in History," by tracing the religious consciousness of mankind through the Hebrew, Greek, and Germanic epochs of religion, science and speculation, according to the law of divine self-manifestation in humanity, toward the perfected millenial church. And the same doctrine of supernatural economies in universal history also has been advocated by the Italian statesman, Cesare Balbo, who held that mankind after showing a progressive degeneration before the advent of Christ, has since shown a progressive amelioration through the influence of the Roman Church; by the German philosopher, Schlegel, who sought to trace a gradual restoration of the divine image in the race as well as in the individual, by means of the Jewish and Christian dispensations; and by the Spanish theologian, Balmes, who, in opposition to Guizot, aimed to vindicate the highest European civilization as but the legitimate fruit of Catholicity. And the natural corruptibility of society has been assumed by the reactionary school of De Bonald and De Maistre, who taught a uniform decadence of all nations with all their interests, as illustrated by the French revolution; whilst the Italian philosopher Rosmini, argued that social

masses everywhere tend to a progressive corruption, which can only be repaired by barbaric new blood, or arrested by favored individuals, such as the Roman Cæsars, or by intellectual and religious castes, such as the Indian Brahmins, the Chinese mandarins, and pre-eminently, the Catholic clergy. At the same time, the extreme millennarians have simply abandoned all civilization to a coming destruction, in hope of the miraculous return and reign of Christ as King of the nations.

On the other side, the revolutionary principles of the Reformation have been re-affirmed by such enlightened churchmen and statesmen as Döllinger and Gladstone, who resist the political and religious supremacy of the Roman Pontiff as inconsistent both with the civil and with the ecclesiastical polity; by dissenting divines, who have denounced the claims of prelacy or presbytery as not less repugnant to Christian than to natural society, and at variance with the primitive Church as well as with the modern State; and by devout patriots who have argued that resistance to tyrants is obedience to God. The theory of human progression has been based upon scriptural as well as scientific principles by the French publicist Buchez, who seeks to unfold the successive economies of the Old and New Testament in accordance with logical and social laws; by the Scottish divine, Patrick Dove, who maintains that the predicted triumph of virtue and religion is involved in the natural progress of the moral sciences; and by the German philosopher Lotze, who enunciates the laws of the whole social development as proceeding in accordance with the divine sovereignty and human freedom. And the perfectibility of Christian society has been assumed by the advanced school of Coleridge, Arnold, Sewall and Rothe, who have looked forward to the ultimate fusion of Church and State in a perfected republic of piety and virtue; whilst the numerous sects of Christian socialists, in the heart of modern civilization, have dreamed of restoring the communism of the disciples at Pentecost.

The great miracles wrought in the social sphere through all the biblical history, have also been scientifically defended and verified. That good and evil angels have mingled in human

affairs is claimed by such writers as Chalmers, Isaac Taylor, and Kurtz as a supernatural fact which may be discerned in the whole career of humanity, the very aspects of civilization and the prospects of Christianity. It is argued that the first temptation by Satan in Paradise and the subsequent struggle between the seed of the serpent and the seed of the woman, have left their traces in all ancient and modern heathenism, whose startling resemblances to Judaism and Christianity are but infernal caricatures and diabolical perversions of the religious instincts of a fallen race, and whose abominable idolatries and cruelties form the fit rites of the prince of the powers of darkness. The temptation of Christ and the numerous cases of demoniacal possession at the time of His mission, marked that crisis in the great struggle when Satan mustered his legions as if for a desperate encounter. And the moral conflicts that followed between Christianity and Paganism were but the continued warfare of the children of light with the rulers of the darkness of this world. The holy angels, meanwhile, have ever been desiring to look into the mysteries of human redemption, welcoming each new-born soul as one of its trophies, and may still be fancied as the majestic spectators of a great historical drama arranged from the beginning of creation, to the intent that now unto principalities in heavenly places might be made known by the Church the manifold wisdom of God. And if to such consistent revelations be added a recent psychical conjecture, that the planet as it grows from its geological through its historic eras, becomes insphered and haloed with ethereal-ized souls, the good and great of all time, whose blood and thought yet live on in ours;

> "The dead, but sceptr'd sovereigns, who still rule
> Our spirits from their urns;"

these, too, may be added to the ranks of solemn lookers-on, that increase from age to age as man increases in knowledge, virtue and power, until at length the earth will but ripen into its full miraculous bloom in the heavens, when the Son of Man shall come again with the glory of the Father and the holy angels.

Eclecticism in Theology.

The scientific theology has also long been claimed by the religious eclectic as his own original domain. From the beginning, since the time of Justin Martyr, the natural theism and ethics found in Greek and Roman philosophy and the semblances of Scripture doctrine discerned in ancient and modern mythology, have ever been held to be the mere relics or germs or imitations of Christianity, and are still so treated by Hardwick, Lücke and Moffat. The natural religion reasoned out by the deist and the physical theology unfolded by the theist have been steadily incorporated in the systems of apologists as foundations of the Christian faith, by Tulloch, Peabody, Wharton, Chadbourne, Thompson, Pirie, Macmillan, Flint. The metaphysical theology of the schools, with its ontological, cosmological, and psychological proofs of a God have been included among the armaments that begird the citadel of revealed truth, by such writers as Buchanan, Hickok, Mahan. Even the new comparative theology or science of religions which at first appeared with an offensive bearing has been converted into a defensive argument by a historical school of divines who maintain there is a special revelation for Christianity in distinction from one that is universal in other religions. All that is established and accepted in each department of the purely scientific theology has thus been captured and held for the benefit and glory of the Christian religion.

That long brilliant series of miracles wrought throughout the history of Judaism and Christianity has been claimed to afford not only the insignia of the true religion, but the only scientific data for a philosophy of all religion, both in the past and in the future of the race. From the time of Bossuet, the religious phenomena of universal history have been grouped around the cross of Christ as a central world-wide fact, in which alone they can find meaning and value. It is held, with more or less clearness, that while the primitive true religion was kept pure among the Hebrews and slowly perfected under a supernatural system of angels, miracles and prophecies, all other religions contemporaneous with it were but its traditional perversions or satanic counterfeits, hovering

around it with their spectral deities, vain altars and lying oracles, like morning clouds through which the Sun of Righteousness at length burst upon the world and

> "On the thought-benighted sceptic beamed
> Manifest Godhead, melting into day
> What floating mists of dark idolatry
> Broke and misshaped the Omnipresent Sire."

Since that transforming epoch, the ancient faiths have been everywhere on the wane; dying down into effete superstitions in Asia, rising and falling with abortive strength in Europe, spreading out in vast putrefaction through Africa and America. Christianity meanwhile under special Providence has been guided from century to century, through inward dissensions and outward persecutions, ever growing fuller in doctrine and form, and becoming equipped with science and art for its final tasks as the one absolute and universal religion of mankind. By its resistless civilization it shall yet destroy the savage and barbaric religions, while in its wide consensus it steadily resumes the latent truths of Judaism, Islamism, Buddhism, until at last it shall have gathered together Moses and Mahomet, Socrates, Confucius and Gotama as captive disciples at the feet of Christ.

At the same time, the whole philosophic religion of our time has been seized and wrought into the biblical theism and sometimes into orthodoxy itself. Nearly every phase of metaphysic or ontologic thought has in some way been Christianized. Even the Holy Trinity has been made to figure as an Hegelian triology. Monism, as a sort of Christian pantheism, has a representative in Sir J. Allanson Picton, whose "Mystery of Matter" represents the universe as a phenomenal manifestation of the Infinite Life or Energy with which the essential God of the Christian is substantially identical. As an idealistic monist, Professor Pünjer, in his Religious Philosophy, would identify the God of Religion with the Absolute of the metaphysician. Other German thinkers, such as the younger Fichte, Carrière, Lotze, advocate Christian Theism in metaphysical systems which lean toward a pantheistic or monistic conception of the world as immanent in yet distinct from God, the one eternal, omnipresent Being enfolding all things in himself.

On the dualistic side, Professor Martineau, in spite of the charge of anthropomorphism, has eloquently shown, in his essays on "Religion and Materialism," that the existence of a Universal Will is the ultimate fact of metaphysical speculation reached alike by La Place, Herschel and Schopenhauer, as well as the dictate of Christian theism. If Du Bois Reymond has pushed the materialistic monist with his psychic cells and ganglions into the absurdity of imagining somewhere in organized nature a monstrous cerebrum or divine brain of the universe, Dr. Martineau argues that Ampère has proved that there are constellations of molecules corresponding to those of worlds, and therefore the ordered heavens may repeat the rhythm of the cerebral particles.

Creationism is advocated by Murphy of Dublin, who seems to have revived the plastic mind of Cudworth under the name of unconscious intelligence and habit in man and nature; by Frohschammer of Munich, who has united Cudworth with Hegel by maintaining that the creative energy, the fundamental principle of the cosmic process is not will or reason alone, but imagination as a teleological plastic force regulating the objective development of the Absolute; and by Kaulich of Prague, in whose system of metaphysics the absolute Creator is made ever immanent in His creation, as seen in the teleological evolution of life and of mind, in the miraculous conception of Christ by parthenogenesis, and in the reunion of nature and spirit by the resurrection as the full realization of the ideal humanity. The strictest evolutionism of Herbert Spencer has found a champion in the Rev. William I. Gill, whose vigorous exposition and defense of that hypothesis against both its advocates and opponents, is designed to clear the way for a theistic theory of the universe which will comprise evolution itself as a vast temple comprises each of its miniature figures.

Pessimism and optimism, according to Dr. Martensen, in his "Christian Ethics," have a foundation in revealed religion; the former, in the doctrine of depravity and lost paradise, and the latter, in that of redemption and paradise regained. Herr Philip Mainländer, in his "Philosophy of Redemption," by completing the system of Kant and Schopenhauer would confirm and reconcile Buddhism and pure Christianity. And Mr.

F. T. Palgrave, in a philosophical poem on the "Reign of Law," celebrates the marriage of an evolutionistic optimism or meliorism with the Christian faith in God as self-revealed in nature and in Christ, the great All-in-All, the Whence and Whither. Dr. David Asher, in a treatise on the oldest of religions, seeks to identify the absolute Will of Schopenhauer with the living Jehova of Judaism, while maintaining the consistency of such reasoning with the optimism of the Old Testament. Other writers are hastening to find the most recent pessimism in the book of Job and Ecclesiastes. There would seem to be no current speculation too fantastic to have been welcomed as an implicit doctrine of Scripture.

The psychical and metaphysical sciences, as thus conquered and fortified by the eclectic spirit, have ever and anon been made illustrious with apologetic sallies and captures, some of which remain as splendid trophies while others may only prove as dangerous as the wooden horse in the siege of Troy.

Eclectic Religious Philosophy.

At length we behold our daring eclectic on the summit of philosophy itself, surveying and claiming the whole domain of the sciences, both rational and revealed, in some bold theory of universal knowledge, like an imperial champion that would fling his challenge in the face of both armies.

The history of modern religious thought is full of attempts to combine reason and revelation, without any adequate philosophical examination of their respective powers and prerogatives, and of pretended harmonies of science and religion, based upon no due inductive investigation of nature, and no true exegetical study of Scripture. It was thus that Jacob Bœhme, the inspired cobler of Goerlitz, in a work on the Birth and Signature of all Being, by an inward divine illumination claimed to have revealed a system of universal science, which was afterwards pursued in England by More and Pordage, in France by Poiret and St. Martin, and in Germany by Baader and Schelling. It was thus that Emanuel Swedenborg, founder of the Church of the New Jerusalem, combining rare scientific and religious attainments, gave to the world, with the authority of a seer, his Celestial Arcana and

Apocalypse Unveiled, wherein was opened to view the entire universe, with all its endless degrees and correspondences, from the worm to the archangel, from nothingness to Deity, throughout heaven, earth and hell. It has been thus, in more recent times, that the devout disciples of Kant, Fichte, Schelling and Hegel have been constructing immense systems of physical and metaphysical science, philosophies of nature and of religion, which aim to embrace the entire content of all possible revelation and experience, in advance of any full empirical study either of the word or of the works of God. And it is thus, in our own day, that many eminent Christian thinkers, undaunted by former failures and the jeers of sceptical critics, are still seeking for some exhaustive theory of knowledge, which shall be at once consistent with their faith in Scripture and their reliance upon reason; adventurous visionaries, who have soared away from earth and time and sense as into the very heaven of absolute truth, Icarus-like, only to fall back again dazzled and bewildered with excess of knowledge; passionate wooers of wisdom who, like Ixion, have but embraced a shadow for a goddess, having forgotten that divine philosophy flees from pedantry, irreverence and pride, and is only to be won in the sincere love of truth as truth, and for its own sake.

With such philosophers, however, should not be classed those Christian eclectics who fail in the great quest simply because their aim is more apologetic than philosophic or if philosophic not fully mastered and pursued. In this spirit Dr. Richard B. Painter, while claiming to study nature and scripture together as scientifically as he would write chemistry and physics, has fully justified the apologetic title of his voluminous work, "Science a Stronghold of Faith." In the same spirit, Bishop Temple, in his Bampton Lectures on "The Relations of Science and Religion," though accepting the latest results of science, assails its agnostic premises and assumed uniformity of nature, in order to find grounds for religion in a conscious ego yielding real knowledge and a free-will independent of natural law. The Rev. W. G. Ground also claims to have unified science and religion on a Christian basis, in his "Examination of Herbert Spencer's Philosophy" and gives some just views of a more constructive philosophy.

Professor Calderwood, in his Ely Lectures on "The Relations of Science and Religion," has very forcibly maintained that both start from rational ground, yet form distinct and sometimes discordant bodies of knowledge to be hereafter harmonized by means of the experience gained from former conflicts. Still more profoundly Doctor Fairbairn, in his "Studies in the Philosophy of Religion," concludes that both Science and Faith, in order to be reconciled, must unite in the mutual recognition of the creation and the Creator as indissoluble and harmonious. Mr. J. J. Murphy has also philosophically argued in his "Scientific Bases of Faith," that a supernatural revelation will be found logically supported by the natural sciences as they are themselves supported by mechanics and mathematics in the structure of knowledge. And numerous other thinkers, such as Dr. Henry B. Smith in his essays entitled "Philosophy and Faith," Dr. Christlieb, in his "Modern Doubt and Christian Belief," Presidents Barnard, Porter, McCosh, Bascom, Professors Morris, Woodrow, Tait, Scholten, Naville, Zeising, Frohschammer, Zöckler, have written formal treatises upon the reconciliation of reason and revelation, or shown a philosophical grasp of the problem, and contributed valuable memoirs and essays towards its elucidation.

Meanwhile, too, a large, more practical class of religious eclectics are engaged in the popular effort to reconcile the existing bodies of scientific and biblical knowledge, without much deep inquiry into their fundamental principles. Mr. James Hinton, of London, in an essay on Man, designed for the right interpretation of nature, has taken the practical ground that the union of science and religion is not optional, a thing to be attempted or avoided, but a fact to which we must conform ourselves, since science of itself is religious, and in its own progress affirms the truths of the Christian records. Professor Joseph Le Conte, in his Sunday lectures on "Religion and Science," has clearly exposed the difficulties and misconceptions which now hinder a perfect understanding between the students of Nature and of Scripture,

and gathered scientific proofs and illustrations of the leading truths in natural and revealed theology. Chancellor Winchell, in his "Reconciliation of Religion and Science," recounts the gradual encroachments of exact knowledge upon the realm of faith; but conserves a pure theism as consistent with the most scientific conception of natural law, and from the history and present state of the physical sciences collects evidence of their accordance with the essential meaning of Scripture. Mr. James F. Bixby, in his "Similarities of Physical and Religious Knowledge," without dwelling upon any of their special correspondences in existing interpretations of nature and Scripture, unfolds their general resemblance of methods and results, their identical interests and underlying unities, and recommends the remedy for their antagonism expressed in his motto from Lowell:

> "Science was Faith once; Faith were Science now,
> Would she but lay her bow and arrows by
> And arm her with the weapons of the time."

Dr. Andrew Peabody, in his Ely lectures on "Christianity and Science," by a rich and lucid argument has shown that both rest upon the same foundations of testimony, experiment and intuition. Chancellor Crosby, in his vigorous essay, "The Bible on the side of Science," has maintained that science has ever been fostered and promoted by lovers of the Bible; that the great leaders of science have been believers in the Bible; that the Bible is a scientific book, full of statements anticipatory and confirmatory of the chief discoveries in the different sciences; and that empirical science can only be completed by the truths of revelation. President McCosh, in his Ely lectures on "Christianity and Positivism," has traversed the sciences with vigor and clearness, discussing the various questions of the day, which are emerging in Natural Theology and Christian apologetics. Professor Dawson, in the Morse lectures on the "Bible and Nature," has combined his large scientific knowledge with an anti-evolutionistic interpretation of such Scriptures as touch upon the story of the earth and man. Professor Tayler Lewis, in the Vedder Lectures, at Rutgers College, on "Nature and the Scriptures," has dwelt with unwavering philosophic faith upon the majesty

and glory of God in the Bible as fully solving all the problems which modern science has raised without being able to master. And to these should be added many of the lectures on the Boyle, Bampton and Hulsean foundations, the Burnet essays, the publications of the Christian Evidence Society, the discussions of the Victoria Institute, and all the countless discourses, journals and reviews which have made this whole subject the trite theme of the day.

The eclectic philosophy, which would thus overrun the wide domain of the sciences in search of new proofs and illustrations of the Christian faith, cannot but be useful and encouraging, but is plainly no more conclusive than a brilliant raid through an enemy's country or a display of trophies before the battle is won.

Crude Religious Culture.

At the last, the eclectic spirit may be seen emerging in practical life, with a premature attempt to blend the religious and secular elements in every sphere of civilization, like the transient occupation of conquered provinces by an army which cannot hold the ground which it wins.

The primitive and mediæval forms of Christian culture have thus been advocated and revived in the midst of modern society, with more or less completeness, by different parties in the various churches and denominations. Mr. St. George Mivart, as an advanced Roman Catholic, in his essays on "Contemporary Evolution," has ingeniously argued that the scientific law of development has reached its climax in doctrinal history by the recent decree of papal infallibility; that the social, political, scientific, and æsthetical evolutions which have followed the Reformation are but a reversion to Paganism; and that the existing conflict between the Pagan and Christian elements of culture can only issue in the survival and re-establishment of the mediæval theocracy and philosophy. The æsthetical, doctrinal, and ecclesiastical ritualists of the English Church, as led by Keble, Pusey and Newman, have been urging a similar restoration of primitive Christianity in the realms of art, science, and politics. Principal Tulloch and Professor Shairp exemplify the re-union of religion and

culture in the Scottish Kirk. The different American churches, though much farther removed from such discussions, are pervaded by philosophical and liturgical tendencies in the same general direction. Dr. Bellows, in his eloquent discourses on the "Suspense of Faith," turns from the distracting anarchy of the present to a glowing future, when literature, art, politics, and religion shall teem with the fruits of a new Christian culture, born of the marriage of European with American influences. While Arthur Hugh Clough would rest content in the classic revival of the last four centuries, and

> "from no building, gay or solemn,
> Can spare the shapely Grecian column;"

James Russell Lowell, in his "Cathedral," depicts the Western Goth, like his Northern ancestor, as but the pioneer of a young and yet more vigorous civilization, in which

> "whatsoe'er
> The form of building or the creed professed,
> The Cross, bold type of shame to homage turned,
> Shall tower as sovereign emblem over all."

Already the religious eclectic is seeking a re-consecration of literature. He would break that false alliance of elegant letters with worldliness, immorality, and irreligion which has been growing for several centuries past, and win back the errant muse of poetry to the sacred haunts of its earlier devotion. According to his special predilections, he prizes Dante, Milton, Herbert, Pollock, Cowper, or Wesley above any of the modern bards who draw inspiration from secular themes. The sacred dramas of Hannah More, the devout verses of Felicia Hemans and Lydia Sigourney, the moral tales of Maria Edgeworth, the religious novels of Elizabeth Sewell and Catharine Sinclair indicate to him the possibilities of a new Christian literature, which shall be made to order, as the reward of blended piety and genius. And forthwith the Sunday-school library becomes stocked with Bible stories and sacred romances, designed to exorcise the heathen mythology of the nursery; the Tract society drives a brisk competition with the cheap novel; the sectarian Publication House embellishes the most polemic orthodoxy with new literary forms; and the religious journal undertakes to sift the wheat from the

chaff of the Satanic press. Or if he have a more philosophical appreciation of the true sources of literary inspiration, he is content to dream of some better time when, as Dr. Peabody has well expressed it, our English literature shall have a renewed Christian baptism, and our poetry a fresh Pentecost from on high.

Already, too, he is aiming at a re-consecration of art. That prodigal child of the Church he would reclaim from its long course of worldly dissipation, and restore the mediæval cathedral, with its cruciform plan, its pictured saints, its sculptured symbols, robed priests, and antiphonal choirs, as the true temple of the Christian muses. He would even celebrate Protestant worship amid the æsthetic appliances of the Catholic ritual, with a pulpit in the Apse, a table for the Altar, a Daily Exhortation long since grown obsolete, a Psalter to be said that ought only to be sung, Calvinistic prayers which were never meant to be intoned, and a Sermon made inarticulate by pillared roofs that were only fitted to gather and roll back the sound of anthems. If he eschew these as relics of popery, then he will borrow any other artistic forms which may be at hand, and straightway he builds a Grecian portico in place of the Gothic spire, surrounds Christian worshippers with Pagan ornaments and emblems, listens to operatic selections instead of joining in familiar hymns, and even in the midst of a revival permits the lay-preacher to ascend the pulpit and exhort to an adjoining confessional, whilst the trills of a solo performer are impressed upon an assembly bowed in silent prayer. Or if he have a more liturgical conception of the just relations of piety and culture, devotion and taste, he seeks a cure for existing evils by reviving a defunct liturgy, or constructing a new order of services, or issuing a manual of forms, or looking beyond such tentative efforts and experiments to the learning, genius, and faith blended in some new Christian art that is yet to be.

In like manner, he would at once Christianize all existing politics. As a faithful Catholic, he would merge the state in the church, and longs for the return of that imperial theocracy which once preserved the balance of power throughout Europe, while it held kings, lords and commons as obedient vassals at

its feet. As a loyal Protestant, he would blend the church with the state, and does not scruple to submit her dogmas to the decisions of courts, to mingle her ritual with public forms, to insert her doctrines in the constitution, and to entrust her whole function of education to the legislature. Or if neither church nor state, as now organized and opposed, can claim his hearty alliance, then he dreams of some new Christian commonwealth, based upon the Scripture ideas of charity, equality and fraternity, and will be heard piping its pastorals amid all the strife of parties and the din of arms. He becomes the philanthropist, who would harmonize the warring nations by means of peace societies, international courts, and world's congresses; or the social reformer who, in this wayward youth of civilization, would inaugurate the mature reign of reason and virtue, as he proceeds to erect, over the very embers of revolution, like villages upon the slope of a volcano, his little sequestered arcadias, phalansteries, communities, which we are invited to admire as actual models of Christian society, and advanced samples of the predicted era of innocence and peace.

And, at the same time, he strives at once to Christianize all existing religion. Viewing heathenism as but a destined province of the papacy, he would heal the divisions of Christendom at the fount of ecclesiastical infallibility, and gather the scattered flock of Christ within the fold of the one chief Shepherd, the Bishop of Rome and successor of St. Peter. Regarding the different religious denominations and churches as more or less analogous and congruous, he would begin the work of fusion and consolidation by combining them externally under Boards of Foreign and Domestic Missions, Bible and Tract Societies, inter-ecclesiastical Conferences, General Church Councils, and Evangelical Alliances. Or should no existing organization meet his ideal of doctrine and polity, then he would fuse all creeds into one, which shall retain only their common truths, and resolve all sects, by himself adding another to the medley. He becomes the religious reformer who at this late day, after eighteen centuries of progress, would proclaim his discovery of the only true Christianity, or the philosophic religionist who would crystalize about the Chris-

tian faith the cognate truths of Judaism, Mohammedanism, Brahminism, Buddhism, Polytheism, together with all the forms of Deism and Pantheism, and gravely invite mankind to flock into his new church of humanity, and proceed to organize the millennium upon his platform.

Thus the impatients on both sides are running into the like absurdity, and would precipitate the same evils. In so far as they prevail, they only fret the cords already strained between religion and science, and threaten to wreck both Christianity and civilization in worse anarchy.

Against such eclecticism it need only be urged, that the existing are not the normal relations of reason and revelation. While in the abstract they are harmonious, yet as at present developed and adjusted, they alike demand of their votaries a spirit of mutual deference and conciliation, and a system of preliminary rules, equally binding upon both, in all their joint researches. Any forced combination of their several products, like that now so frequently attempted, overlooks their present anomalous condition, and is, for several reasons, to be discouraged.

In the first place, it is at best specious and partial. Too often it consists of a mere rude welding of dogmas with hypotheses, devoid of any rational consistence, and leaving out large portions of fact, or mixing them with mere conjecture. No cognitive system can be real and universal which simply accepts or rejects the results of research at the bidding of prejudice, and then works them into a fantastic composition to please a devout or a speculative fancy. Every attempt at a summation of truth which proceeds in the interest of either party, so far from involving a thorough fusion of knowledge with knowledge, can only issue in a crude amalgam of fact and theory, fiction and reality.

In the second place, it is in its mode of action illogical and unscientific. Instead of patiently waiting for a strict induction and full exegesis, it takes the existing imperfect results of both, and blindly, without reference to first principles, proceeds to combine them, forcing nature out of its sphere as a mere witness to Scripture, and Scripture out of its sphere as a mere witness to nature. But so long as a scientific hypothesis

is not verified, or a theological dogma is not demonstrated, the risk must remain, that, in using either for the benefit of the other, we may be only driving truth into alliance with error. The known in both is alone that which can or does become consistent. Only when we have logically adjusted the relations of reason and revelation, and studied all the phenomena in their vital connections, and without either scientific or religious prejudice, shall we be able to frame that summative system by means of which we may sift the ascertained from the conjectural, fuse the discovered with the revealed, and so build the temple of knowledge with the lasting cement of truth.

In the third place, it is in its scope narrow and premature. Without projecting any scheme of logical organization throughout the sciences, but simply because their rational and revealed portions here and there are coming into harmony, it goes precipitately to work upon the vast remainder, and would mould it at once into a system. And yet, we are now only in the first stages of the great reconciliation. Fiercer strifes may await us, in the more undeveloped sciences, than any we have survived. If astronomy could make such warfare, at the mere outposts of revelation, when it dwarfed the earth into an atom in space; if geology, at the walls of the fortress, strikes such a panic now that it threatens to reduce man to an ephemeron in time; and if anthropology is actually jarring the foundations with its effort to degrade him to an autochthon in the scale of being; what may we expect, when at length the citadel is assailed by those mental and moral sciences which, having human nature for their subject, and involving all the great questions of human duty and destiny, shall impinge upon the most peculiar topics of inspiration, upon the actual contents as well as credentials of the heavenly message? He would be blind indeed to all the lessons of history, who dreams that science and religion have yet reached the limit either of their opposition or of their contribution to each other; and if we may be cheered by past triumphs, not less should we be warned to prepare for coming conflicts.

In the fourth place, it is in its whole practical aim visionary and vague. Not only does it presume, without any truly rational process, to have reached the final system of know-

ledge, but it hastens to organize it in defiance of the present social state. Whereas, even if it had the true ideal, it is not to be forced upon the world in the way of artificial reform and social reconstruction. Whenever it comes, as it silently pervades the influential mind, it may bring with it an organizing force of its own, which, without visible concert, passing through and beneath all mere institutions, shall slowly dissolve and recompose the whole existing civilization by changing the opinions upon which it is based. For aught we can tell, the present system of church and state, with all its jarring sects and governments, may be left upon the pathway of time as a mere outworn chrysalis, from which society shall have struggled forth into new life and freedom, and the entire political organization of the race, at the time when the nations shall be fused in the truth and tranquillized by love, may have an aspect of patriarchal simplicity, or be moulded into some homogeneous structure of which no type can now be found. But, whatever it may be, we can at least be sure that it is not to be compacted from existing institutions or wrought by immediate efforts. Certainly no sect, political or ecclesiastical, now shows the means of assimilating all the rest as by sheer propagandism or through any plastic force; and no theory of human perfectibility that has yet been broached could, by the mere display of its charms, lull the social tumult to peace.

We must therefore grant that the two interests, as now related, cannot at once be brought into a just, safe and lasting union. By rashly overstepping the limits which still sunder them and illogically proceeding to a forced compact of their several bodies of knowledge, we simply drive them into false relations which must sooner or later dissolve and throw them apart again with harsh recoil and estrangement. Let not science offend the oracle it would consult, by any irreverent spirit; and let not religion repel the intelligence it would claim, by any irrational process; but let each learn the other's virtues and laws and only join hands in the oneness of truth and upon the sure footing of mutual faith and love.

CHAPTER V.

MODERN SCEPTICISM BETWEEN SCIENCE AND RELIGION.

As we turn once more to our imaginary battle-field we behold that last dismal scene after the glory of war has collapsed in rout and panic, when brave men are quailing in a good cause, and the beaten chieftains are wrangling over their defeat or sitting apart in sullen gloom. We think of how much pride and courage and hope have been precipitated into such chagrin and despair and weakness; and we are almost ready to forget the duty of victory in pity for the vanquished, and to pardon the baseness of surrender as but submission to fate.

In some such mood, Mr. Matthew Arnold, the academic poet of the modern school of ennui, would seem to have expressed the despair of baffled philosophy at finding her perennial problems still unsolved:

> "Achilles ponders in his tent;
> The kings of modern thought are dumb.
> Silent they are, though not content,
> And wait to see the future come.
> They have the grief men had of yore,
> But they contend and cry no more."

And Schleiermacher, gloomily foreboding the present crisis nearly fifty years ago, wrote to his friend Lücke: "I shall not live to see those days, but may lay myself down to my last

sleep in peace. But what do you and your contemporaries intend to do? Will you entrench yourselves behind the outworks and let yourselves be blockaded by science? The bombardment of derision would do you little harm. But the blockade? The starving out by science, which, because you thus entrench yourselves, will be forced by you to raise the standard of unbelief? Is it thus that the knot of history is to be severed, and Christianity to be allied with ignorance, and science with unbelief?"

We have termed this class of religious thinkers the Despondents or Sceptics, because they despair of any reconciliation of the two great interests, and can but lament them as doomed to their present relations. The breaches between Scripture and science they see no way of healing. From the ideal unity of truth they turn away to the actual disorder of knowledge, and wander amid its wilderness as in a maze of contradiction and anomaly; whilst in the practical sphere they are consistently led to disavow all attempts at social amelioration, and to surrender even the hope of human progress. In short, they are the recreants on the field of philosophy who would sheath their swords in mid battle, or snap them asunder in the agony of supposed defeat.

In contrast with the Extremists and the Indifferentists they may readily grant the theoretical importance of the question before us, and in concert with the Eclectics, they may even at times have attempted its logical settlement; but somehow the attempt only issues in failure and discouragement. Owing to a sceptical or unbelieving temperament, or from a love of singularity and fondness for paradox, or from a surfeit of speculation and genuine bewilderment of reason, or in sheer reaction from the very eclecticism that has failed to combine the two sets of truths, they accept them both, only to pronounce them incongruous and irreconcileable. And they may be found either in the ranks of religion or of science.

On the one side, the religious sceptic or desponding religionist will disparage not less revelation than reason. He looks upon both as belonging to an earthly and transitory state, and hereafter to be merged in the rapt intuition and full apocalypse of truth. The one is so meagre and the other so

erring, that he cannot hope they will ever together yield enough of knowledge to displace all ignorance, or indeed do scarcely aught else than show their own necessary imperfection. To combine the mysteries of Nature with those of Scripture, he will maintain, must only breed increased perplexity, and will bewail the present chaos of doctrines and theories as but the inevitable and final state of earthly knowledge. His theology bids adieu to science as a lorn child of earth, and seeks some mystic elysium in the skies.

On the other side, the scientific sceptic or desponding scientist, will disparage not less reason than revelation. In his view they are both occupied with questions which are insoluble, and upon which together they can shed only enough of light to make the darkness visible; the one serving but to show the unrevealed to be unrevealable, and the other, to prove the undiscovered to be undiscoverable. He will even argue that their joint process must have its logical goal in the incomprehensible and unknown, and will cite the meagre conclusions in which they unite as proof that all our knowledge is only a laborious learning of our ignorance. Science is to him but a cruel Sphinx, whose smile only mocks while it charms, and at whose feet even theology must sit in dumb despair.

The traces of such scepticism may be seen in history at every great juncture, when old faiths are decaying and new truths emerging into view, while yet their consistence and harmony are in question. It was somewhat of this spirit, in its scientific form, which pervaded all philosophy amid the declining mythologies of Greece and Rome, as expressed by the cynic, the stoic, and the satirist, and at length unconsciously voiced in the sneer of Pilate to Jesus, "What is truth?" It was somewhat of this spirit, in its religious form, which prompted the rationalizing fathers, such as Philo and Origen, to surrender the obvious sense of Scripture to the demands of Platonism and even to evaporate its essential doctrines into metaphysical abstractions. It was somewhat of this spirit which reappeared in its religious form among the sceptical schoolmen, such as Cusa and Agrippa, in their lamentations upon the uncertainty and vanity of all know-

ledge, both divine and human. It has been this spirit, in both of its forms, which has since animated all Protestant rationalism, widening the chasm between Scripture and science, until it seems impassable. And it is now this spirit which would discourage all attempts to heal the great schism, by recalling the failures of an unwise eclecticism which has rashly essayed the task, and citing the misgivings of veteran divines and disappointed thinkers, who can only view any renewal of the effort with that sad incredulity with which age commiserates the dreams of youth, and experience chills the enthusiasm of innocence.

The history of religious scepticism has been reviewed from various stand-points by such writers as Röhr, Saintes, Hunt, Tulloch, Stephen, Rigg, Mackay, Fisher, Gillette, Frothingham, and its numerous illustrations may be gathered from the special treatises which have hitherto been noticed. All that the present argument requires is the selection of a few examples of such sceptical scientists and religionists as would needlessly surrender important classes of scientific facts, which might be brought into harmony with religion, or essential portions of religious truth, which ought to be kept in harmony with science. And as we proceed, it should be borne in mind that religious scepticism admits of many phases and degrees, from the reluctant doubt of the believer to the ready cavil of the critic, and that the farthest departures from traditional orthodoxy, in a Schleiermacher, a Channing, or a Kingsley need never stint our praise of their true Christian piety and virtue. The typical examples of the sceptical spirit are not the struggling, courageous souls who would rather believe than doubt, and whose very perplexity often comes from an honest effort to conquer their own misgivings or relieve the scruples of other minds; but the more timorous, cynical natures who will have their sneer even at the expense of truth, and neither themselves lay the doubts which they have raised, nor encourage any to attack and overcome them.

We shall meet such sceptics in each of the physical sciences, amid the great battle of infidels and apologists, fleeing from the field of controversy, like fugitives who sound a retreat at the rear, while yet the shouts of victory are ascending at the front.

Scepticism in Astronomy.

The whole biblical astronomy has thus at times been depreciated. From the first, there have been doubts as to its consistency with celestial physics. It was not surprising, surely, that any theistic arguments based upon the old Ptolemaic system should be received with sceptical misgivings. Alphonso of Castile, the liberal patron of the astronomical tables bearing his name, after vainly trying to comprehend the complex scheme of the seventy-nine crystalline spheres, is said to have impatiently exclaimed that had he been present at the creation he could have suggested a wiser and better plan of the world. Milton thought so little of the pious uses of such a system, that he represents it as only fitted to move the laughter of the angels at the quaint opinions of men:

> "how they will wield
> The mighty frame, how build, unbuild, contrive
> To save appearances; how gird the sphere
> With centric and eccentric scribbled o'er,
> Cycle and epicycle, orb in orb."

Montaigne, the literary sceptic, deprecating the horrible atheism to which the Reformation was tending, doubted whether the theory of Copernicus might not simply follow that of Ptolemy as one philosophical system has ever been superseded by another. Paley himself, though a Copernican, consistently with his utilitarian view of the divine attributes, depreciated somewhat the whole astronomical argument as compared with that afforded by the structure of the human body, which he thought more obviously adapted to our welfare than the solar system. The late Rev. Baden Powell, in his Order of Nature, after restricting the so-called cosmotheology to one or two vague natural attributes, cites English divines with French atheists to prove the futility of identifying the hypothetical First Cause of the heavens with the Jehovah of the Hebrew Scriptures. Mr. Maurice refuses to believe that any modern astronomical ideas could have occurred to the shepherd boy to whom the heavens declared the glory of God and the firmament showed His handiwork. Professor Owen confesses that he does not pretend to know for what

purpose the stars were made, any more than the flowers or the crystalline gems or other innumerable beautiful objects. The great astronomer Bessel would dissipate with scientific arguments the conjecture of those feeling hearts who seek for sympathy even in the Moon. And when intelligent Christian thinkers, like Coleridge, Hegel, and Whewell, discourage all attempts to connect the theory of inhabited worlds with the doctrine of the Heavenly Father and the angels, by representing the unnumbered planets, suns, and galaxies as so much gross matter, mere lifeless masses of cinder, slag and vapor, the worthless refuse of reason, and unveil the very heaven of heavens as a godless solitude, it is no wonder that other, differently constituted persons are ready to exclaim, with more meaning than the poet intended:

> "O star-eyed Science! hast thou wandered there
> To waft us but the message of despair?"

Pascal could only find relief from the overwhelming magnificence of the material universe in the thought, that though it were combined to annihilate man, yet man would be greater than it, since he alone knows that he dies. And Daniel Webster was so oppressed by the sense of human insignificance in contrast with the immensity of creation, that he directed it should be inserted in his epitaph as his chief difficulty in accepting the Christian faith.

At the same time, the rationalistic critics of Scripture, from Semler to Baur, have been busy with scientific explanations of the astronomical miracles as mere cosmical phenomena, which were innocently exaggerated and embellished by the mythic fancy of the ancient world, then active among the Jews as well as the Gentiles. The arrest of the sun and moon at the command of Joshua is treated as a bold, rhetorical trope in the narrative, or if an actual occurrence, as an optical illusion such as the mock-moon of the Arctic atmosphere, or a fortunate coincidence of the long summer twilight. The star of the wise men was an artless plagiarism of the star of Balaam, or a comet readily magnified into a divine omen by some pious Jewish merchants, or a horoscope cast by eastern astrologers in the constellation of the Fish for the ascendant house of Judah, or a fortunate conjunction of the planets

Jupiter and Saturn in a new brilliant luminary about the date of the nativity. Even the celestial glory and angelic chorus which surprised the simple shepherds of Galilee is, with Luciferan cunning, depicted as only the glare of passing lanterns borne by chanting worshippers of the expected Messiah. And the last great conflagration itself, with the flaming heavens and falling stars, is regarded as but a symbolic picture after the manner of prophecy, prefiguring the final overthrow of the earthly powers and kingdoms which oppose the advent and reign of Christ.

Scepticism in Geology.

The biblical geology has, in like manner, been largely disparaged. A reaction has followed the extravagant mysticism of devout physicists in the middle ages, such as Albertus and Vincent de Beauvais, who, in their zeal to make science thoroughly Christian, strove to exhibit all nature as full of biblical symbols, allegories, and mementos; and the extreme tendency of many natural theologians to seek divine purposes in the most trivial phenomena has driven some of their critics to treat all the religious lessons of terrestrial physics as the mere conceits of a pious fancy which would absurdly exalt man as the final cause of an infinite universe, and hail as special Providences the chance vicissitudes of the seasons and other incidental beauties and utilities of nature. In place of the pious writings which glowingly depicted the whole earth as full of the divine wisdom and goodness, we now have exact scientific treatises which simply discharge the surrounding creation of all religious significance, leave it as hard and dry as the skeleton mechanism which it hides, and make the more devout student fain to protest with Wordsworth against such arid naturalism as worse than the "fair humanities of old religions:"

> "Great God! I'd rather be
> A pagan suckled in a creed outworn;
> So might I standing on this pleasant lea
> Have glimpses that would make me less forlorn—
> Have sight of Proteus rising from the sea,
> Or hear old Triton blow his wreathed horn."

Some physicists would seem even to take pains to exclude all traces of intelligent order and benevolent design from the scientific view of nature. Professor Morse assures the American Scientific Association that the mathematical bee of the Bridgewater Essayists no longer builds a perfect geometric cell under the critical eye of the most recent science, as pursued by the late Professor Jeffries Wyman; and suggests that Professor Chauncey Wright was equally fortunate in showing that the orderly arrangement of leaves of plants along their axes was due to circumstances of growth and not a result of blind law. And other objectors, while admitting the symmetry of form and harmony of color which appear in the works of Nature, have denied that such effects could have had any benevolent purpose in the flowers which are born to blush unseen, or the gems which are hidden in the unfathomed depths of ocean.

Biblical students and divines have pronounced the Hebrew cosmogony unscientific, and relinquished the task of harmonizing it with modern geology. Schleiermacher, long before the appearance of the "Essays and Reviews," confessed himself ready to give up the work of the six days, the very idea of creation, and even the whole of the Old Testament in order to save the New. Kalisch, in his commentary, declared the first chapter of Genesis wholly irreconcilcable with the accepted results of physical science. Baden Powell terms it a Judaic myth which has died a natural death. Another of the Essayists and Reviewers, Goodwin, maintains on the contrary, that there is nothing poetical or figurative in the whole narrative; that Moses was simply an early speculator, or sort of Hebrew Descartes, who has become obsolete, and that it has pleased Providence to use his human utterance for the education of mankind in the true doctrine of the creation. The more orthodox Mr. Rorison, in replying to Goodwin, admits that it should be read as a Psalm of Creation, and that the conciliatory schemes of Hugh Miller and McCaul are mere make-shifts. Maurice, in his Lectures upon Genesis, exhausts it of all historic reality and resolves it into a sort of philosophic mythus, exhibiting the succession of plants, birds and animals, not as actual phenomena, beheld by Moses,

but as divine ideals rising toward man, the climax of creation. A Layman, writing to Mr. Maurice, on the relative claims of the Bible and Science, expresses his impatience at the attempts to show that the author of the first chapter of Genesis was inspired by a special miracle to use language which should anticipate all the changing phases of human discovery. Mr. Thomas Hughes, in the "Tracts for Priests and People," avers, that he would be none the worse if the Mosaic cosmogony were to disappear to-morrow. And Mr. Orr asserts that Unitarians of the present day do not conceive themselves bound to defend the geology of Moses.

The geological miracles of the Old and New Testament have been stript of their supernatural halo by the German rationalistic exegetes Michaelis, Eichhorn, Paulus and Bauer, and reduced to the most ordinary phenomena. According to such critics the Deluge of Noah was but a local freshet, since magnified into a universal judgment. It was simply a volcanic eruption which overwhelmed Sodom and Gomorrah with fire and brimstone, like that which has since destroyed the cities of Herculaneum and Pompeii. The plagues of Egypt, the crossing of the Red Sea, the wanderings in the wilderness, the showers of quails and manna were exceptional, yet natural events, which might have occurred in the history of any nomadic people, but became exaggerated through the national vanity of the Jews into divine interpositions. Korah, Dathan and Abiram were swallowed up by an opportune earthquake or caught in a prepared pit-fall. The legal terrors of Mount Sinai arose from a passing storm of thunder and lightning, which fittingly illuminated the face of the lawgiver in the view of the awe-struck Israelites. And the later physical miracles of Jesus were but feats of magic or extraordinary phenomena, afterwards embellished by the Messianic fancy of His followers. The stilling of the tempest was only a sudden calm on rounding a head-land. The water made wine had occult vinous properties, or may have been simply a private wedding present to surprise the guests. The draught of fishes was due to a passing shoal. The loaves in five baskets were multiplied by magic or only tasted as in a sacrament. The tribute money was simply the proceeds of Peter's fishing. The disciples in

the midnight storm perceived Jesus but indistinctly as He waded in the shallows or walked upon the shore, to which He easily lifted the too venturesome apostle. The cursed fig-tree was blighted by an oriental sun. Even the awful prodigies of the crucifixion did not exceed those of an ordinary eclipse and earthquake. And the magnificent descriptions of the future destruction and renovation of the material earth were but the glowing language of political prophecy, in reference to the downfall of Jerusalem and other anti-christian powers and kingdoms.

Scepticism in Anthropology.

The biblical anthropology has begun to fall under the same destructive criticism. Since the standard illustrations of the divine benevolence afforded by the animal and human body have been found faulty in some of their details, doubts are thrown upon the whole teleological argument in the name of science. It is objected to such reasoning that all animate nature is full of defective and malevolent contrivance. Cuvier confessed himself doubtful as to the advantageous structure of the sloth which, though a vertebrate animal, is incapable of walking. Buffon declared that he could see no marks of divine wisdom in the hump of the camel. Geoffroy St. Hilaire refused to ascribe good intentions, short methods, and best ends to Nature as an intelligent being, and likened the doctrine of prospective contrivances and compensations in the animal world to the absurdity of supposing that a man with crutches had been predestined to a paralyzed or amputated leg. Professor Helmholtz has said that he would return to any good optician an instrument as imperfect as the human eye. Many naturalists are so impressed by the anatomical likeness of man to the anthropoid apes that they hesitate to class him as a distinct species, made in the divine image, and set over the animal kingdom. And some divines, in their desperate perplexity at such resemblances, have been ready to persuade themselves that the monkey, instead of being an original divine creation, is but a subsequent Satanic caricature of humanity. Paley has admitted that diseased and monstrous organisms, poisonous serpents, and beasts of prey, though

they may suggest an intelligent Creator, can prove nothing as to His wisdom and goodness; and he labors to show how the pain and cruelty which disfigure the animal creation, as well as the evils of sickness, age, and death to which man is subject, are nevertheless alleviated and compensated in the general economy of nature. And Tennyson, after confronting his sceptic with such anomalies, can only make him instinctively protest against them as one

> "Who trusted God was love indeed,
> And love creation's final law,
> Though Nature, red in tooth and claw
> With ravine, shrieked against his creed."

The literal story of the creation and fall of Adam has already been abandoned by many exegetical scholars, and treated as a mere sacred myth or allegory. Philo, Origen, and the Alexandrian Platonists have come again in modern critics, who sacrifice the historical to an infused dogmatic or philosophic sense. According to Eichhorn and Paulus its whole design was to paint the loss of the golden age, of which traditions linger among all nations. In the serpent which tempted Eve, Rothe, Steffens, and Martensen have perceived only an emblem or ideal personification of sensual appetite, of pre-existent sinfulness, of the adverse cosmical principle of nature, or a mere rhetorical figure for Satan. The tree of good and evil was a symbol of probation, and by its intoxicating fruit represents the evil effects of pruriency and lust. The more idealizing interpreters, such as Kant, Ammon, and Hegel, denying the doctrine of original sin, can perceive nothing but a poetical description of the advance of man from savage beastliness to rational freedom, at the calamitous cost attending all knowledge. And there are still others, such as Professor Jowett, who, having accepted the new theories of animal and human evolution, are ready to surrender the whole dogmatic as well as historic sense of the narrative, and reduce it to a level with the myths of Prometheus and Pandora.

The anthropological miracles of the Bible, under the same sceptical treatment, have vanished into ordinary ethnical and physical phenomena. According to the naturalistic critics, the tower of Babel, if anything more than an allegorical picture

of the origin of languages and nations, was but the seat of an ancient Gentile empire, out of whose anarchy the Jews had escaped. The counterpart gift of tongues and fusion of peoples at Pentecost had no other foundation than the simultaneous use by the excited apostles of a few neighboring dialects, under flickering lamps, in the midst of a whirlwind. The incarnation of Christ as the Second Adam was a natural birth, subsequently embellished by His enthusiastic followers, after the Jewish hero-type, with visions, trances, voices, and apparitions. A dove passing at the moment of His baptism was accepted as an omen of the Holy Spirit. His numerous miracles of healing, so far as genuine cures, were performed upon nervous patients by a peculiar medical skill like that of clairvoyance and mesmerism. The dead raised to life had been cases of suspended animation or premature interment. A sudden effect of sunrise upon Mount Tabor, as He stood against the sky conversing with two of His apostles, was construed by the drowsy disciples below into His transfiguration. His resurrection was the recovery from a trance through the stimulating effects of the spices, and was necessarily kept secret by a few faithful followers. Even His ascension was only a mysterious disappearance in the sunset-clouds of the mountain-top, suggesting to the beholders the translation of Enoch and Elijah. And His predicted kingdom, with the earth restored to a paradise, and the whole race in a state of peace and innocence, is no more than a consequent prognostic of the Messianic fancy.

The physical sciences, as thus deprived of their biblical portions of truth, would leave us simply an astronomy without a Father in heaven, a geology without a Creator of the earth, and an anthropology without the divine image.

Scepticism in Psychology.

We may also meet groups of the same timid sceptics in each of the psychical sciences, ready to quail at every infidel doubt and yield up every apologetic defence, like traitorous cowards who spike the guns of their fortress on the most distant menace of the enemy.

The biblical psychology had scarcely been constructed

before it was thus surrendered. The theistic proofs of Descartes and Samuel Clarke, claiming external reality for the internal idea of a Perfect Being, were set aside as speculative, vague and unscientific; not less absurd, according to Kant, than if one should fancy he possessed a hundred crowns because he could conceive of them. It was denied that any innate idea of God can be found in untutored savages and unsophisticated children. The traces of divine benevolence in the æsthetic sense of beauty in nature and art have been obscured by resolving that faculty into a mere inheritance of pagan culture, or describing it as a capacity for exquisite pain as well as pleasure. Of the lauded rewards of virtue, Burke declared they were treated like make-weights,in scales hung in a shop of horrors for weighing so much actual crime against so much contingent advantage. Even the moral proof of a God, for which Kant would capitulate after surrendering all the rest, has been betrayed by ethical writers who have made conscience a mere habit or tradition, so worthless as to have suggested in heathen minds divine lawgivers who countenanced murder, lust and pillage. It is openly discussed in the "Nineteenth Century," whether there can be any base or germ of morality outside of the Christian ethics. And all the time-worn paradoxes of mental science are the while paraded to the scandal of the unbeliever. Milton would seem to have ironically included them among the dismal pastimes of fallen spirits as they sat apart on a hill retired,

> —"and reason'd high
> Of providence, foreknowledge, will and fate,
> Fixed fate, free-will, foreknowledge absolute;
> And found no end in wand'ring mazes lost."

Pascal, in his thoughts upon the grandeur and misery of man, depicted him as but a conscious enigma, unable to conceive of matter, unable to conceive of spirit, and yet forced to conceive of both as united in himself; a depository of the truth, and yet a medley of uncertainties; a judge of all things, and yet a worm of the dust; an incomprehensible monster; the glory and the scandal of the universe. In our own materialistic era, devout thinkers are questioning anew the cumulative proofs of immortality. And Poetry itself, in the great

elegiac of the time, after voicing all the varied hopes and fears of the bereaved heart, can only leave it to its own baffled yearnings,

> "An infant crying in the night,
> An infant crying for the light,
> And with no language but a cry."

The doctrines of grace in the soul have been losing their saintly halo in the gairish day of modern thought. Regeneration, justification, and sanctification, faith, repentance and joy in the Holy Ghost, all the divine acts and supernatural exercises, have been evaporated into mere æsthetic fancies, moral duties, and logical abstractions. According to the German speculative divines, Schleiermacher, De Wette, and Marheinecke, religion consists in the sentiment of the Infinite, the perception of the Divine, the knowledge of the Absolute. We are regenerated by participating in the human-divine life of Christ as still incarnate in the Church; we may be justified by our own penitent acts; we can only become immortal by losing our individuality in the eternal and the universal; and we are to be glorified through the expansion and dissolution of our finite consciousness in the infinite consciousness of God. According to the Anglican Platonists, Maurice, Kingsley and Jowett, the true Christ is already latent in every human being; all men are children of God and heirs of the kingdom of heaven; conversion is the spontaneous development of the Christian life; and the new-birth as a supernatural change is a mere fancy of the ecstatic apostles which the Church has since wrought into a dogma. American Unitarian divines, such as Hedge, Farley and Bellows, have re-stated and defined the same doctrines in somewhat similar terms; and in many orthodox pulpits they are no longer held forth with the uncompromising rigor of a former age.

The psychological miracles of Scripture are waning before the dawn of science into the most familiar mental phenomena. The Psalms, Prophecies, Gospels and Epistles are treated as but the inspirations of devout genius. The demoniacs were mere religious madmen who could only be cured through their own hallucinations, as when the Gadarene was permitted to believe that he saw a herd of possessed swine rushing

down into the sea. The Witch of Endor and the damsel at Ephesus simply imposed upon their cotemporaries, like many a vulgar impostor since. The conversion of St. Paul occurred in a thunder-storm, by which he was struck blind to the earth with a mental image of Christ seemingly projected in the sky. His visit to Paradise was a sacred trance. The miracles of the apostles were wrought through the credulity of the populace. The supernatural gifts of the Spirit were exceptional endowments or the morbid phenomena of religious excitement. And all the apparitions, suggestions, and influences of angels and saints, in the early or modern church, are to be ranked with the ghost-stories of a village fire-side.

Scepticism in Sociology.

The biblical sociology might almost be said to have been abandoned without a blow. Few attempts have been made to harmonize it with the modern science of civilization. The great historical proof of an intelligent and moral Governor of mankind, derived from the consent of nations and ages, is rejected as obscure, contradictory and misleading. It is doubted whether the devil-worship of savage tribes or the gross mythologies of more cultivated peoples, can corroborate the pure theism of the Hebrew and Christian theocracy. The alleged marks of divine goodness in the social constitution are questioned in view of the distressing inequalities of poverty and wealth, vice and virtue, grandeur and meanness, which Paley and Chalmers have striven to palliate and explain. Doubts are thrown upon the general moral sense or public conscience for which Butler pleaded as a proof of the divine justice, when it is seen how often the world has applauded successful villainy and persecuted its best benefactors. And in the wide realm of universal history, it is still debated, whether the notion of final cause or design can even be admitted. Bacon speaks of deserts in history as in nature, like the long, dreary interval of the dark ages, for which no adequate cause can be assigned. Hegel has no room in his philosophy for unhistorical nations and races, that have been cast off as mere dross in the process of refining that absolute

reason which is yet to govern the world. And it is seen that sacred historians, like Bossuet and Prideaux, are obliged to leave out of their scheme of universal Providence, vast portions of mankind which have played no part in its development, whole civilizations in Western Asia and South America which have long since perished, like ships at sea, with scarce a wreck to tell the tale. Even those who admit special divine purpose in social phenomena are soon perplexed with worse anomalies than the serpents and monsters, the pestilences and tornados which mar the face of physical nature, in the monsters of cruelty that have scourged mankind, in the massacre of St. Bartholomew, the fall of Poland, and the great unexpiated crimes of history.

> "If plagues or earthquakes break not heaven's design,
> Why then a Borgia or a Catiline?"

And after all that has been written by enthusiastic dreamers in favor of human progress and perfectibility, there are less sanguine observers to whom the utter destruction of the whole existing civilization in some vast political convulsion or planetary disturbance would seem no more incredible than the bursting of a bubble or the blighting of a flower.

The doctrine of the Church as a divine institution has been pared down to the baldest rationalistic socialism. Its polity, worship, sacraments, all its supernatural means of grace, are merged and lost in mere moral and political ideals. As variously defined by the German rationalists, it is an organization of the theanthropic life of Christ, or a growing Christian republic, or a society for the promotion of natural religion and virtue. Its sacraments are mere didactic emblems and badges of universal brotherhood. In the system of the English rationalists the Church is the expansion of the family and national principle, or the world under a religious aspect, or the State in a Christian form. Baptism merely affirms the fact that men are God's children and new creatures in Christ; the Priest simply celebrates the great sacrifice made once for all and declares a universal absolution; and daily services, frequent communions, commemorations of saints and martyrs, and religious orders are to be prized only as aids and sanctions of our common Christian life. Even within the bosom

of orthodox American communions, scarcely less rationalistic conceptions may be found in many members, who treat the Church as a temporary convenience, the ministry as a class of moral teachers with no exclusive function, public worship as an extemporaneous performance, and holy ordinances as useless forms.

The political miracles of the Bible, under the scientific scepticism, have been declining into common social phenomena. The supernatural judgments and deliverances of the Jewish theocracy in time of war, famine, and pestilence, were mere Providential events, such as still figure in State-services on days of public humiliation and thanksgiving. The angels that at times have mingled in human affairs were originally the creations of Persian fancy, and are no more real than were the mistaken aerial shadows of the images on the Cathedral of Milan. The miraculous progress of the early Church can be explained by natural causes. As the world's history is the world's judgment and Christ has already come again in His Church, the last grand assize is but a dramatic vision. And the New Jerusalem, descending from heaven to earth, is but the type of a perfected Christian state.

Scepticism in Theology.

The biblical theology has been betrayed within the very walls of the citadel. All the great theistic arguments of rational or metaphysical theology, so carefully wrought in the schools, have been exploded, like bursting guns upon the ramparts, to the derision of the enemy. It was shown by Kant, Hamilton and Mansel that the ontological proof, derived from necessary existence, would absurdly make our thought the condition of reality; that the cosmological proof, derived from contingent existence, would groundlessly uphold the world with our notion of a cause; and that the teleological proof, derived from natural order and design, would weakly infer an Infinite Creator from a finite creation. Coleridge, in his day, deprecated the effort to represent the Deity, not only as a necessary, but as a necessitated being; and lamented the taste for books of natural theology, physico-theology, scientific

evidences of Christianity, as tending to displace the worship of Jehovah for a mere sentimental adoration of Nature;

> "A sense sublime
> Of something far more deeply interfused,
> Whose dwelling is the light of setting suns,
> And the round ocean and the living air,
> And the blue sky and the deep heart of man."

The moral theology, as we have seen, has fared no better. Arguments have been written upon the atheistic tendency of Butler's Analogy. Pitt is said to have acknowledged that it raised more doubts in his mind than it ever solved. And the new comparative theology would seem to have been already left like a deserted field-piece, in the hands of infidels, by apologists who have given up all paganism as a mere abortive growth of original sin or a diabolical caricature of Christianity. Or if a few divines have been striving to re-capture the lost munition, it is only to turn it against their own works, by lowering Christianity as much as they are lifting heathenism in the scale of true religion. There is, in fact, not a point of contact between the scientific and the biblical theology which has not been unwarily and sometimes ignominiously abandoned.

All the peculiar doctrines of revealed religion, the high mysteries of the Trinity, the incarnation, the atonement, have been stript of their divine splendor by a rationalistic speculation, and bleached into the most colorless metaphysical abstractions. The German speculative theologians, who are disciples of Fichte, Schelling and Hegel, have sought the Trinity in a mere successive, historical manifestation of the Creator, Saviour and Sanctifier of mankind; or in the objective, subjective and correlate phases of the infinite consciousness; or in the triplicity of the dialectic process. The incarnation is treated as but the continuous embodiment of the Divine Word, or Eternal Son of God, in the human race, and the atonement as the reconciliation of the finite reason with the Infinite Reason, the union of the human with the divine in the development of the Absolute. The English clergymen, who have been restoring Plato and Philo, have represented the second person of the Trinity as the Logos or Divine reason, manifested fully in the man

Jesus, but still potential in every human being; and the atonement, according to its literal meaning, as the process of becoming at-one with God. And American divines, both in and out of the Unitarian Church, are advocating, more or less knowingly, systems of mere natural religion, and couching them in Scripture phrases and orthodox forms.

All the miraculous evidences of Christianity, its divine insignia among the other religions of the world, have been gradually, by a scientific biblical criticism, degraded into mere sacred myths and legends. First came the early rationalistic interpreters, such as Ernesti, Semler, and Michaelis, studying the Bible as they would Homer or Livy, in the light of contemporaneous history, and treating its miracles as popular superstitions to which Moses and Christ had accommodated their teachings in a rude age of the world. Then followed the naturalistic critics, such as Eichhorn and Paulus, ingeniously explaining the supernatural events of the sacred history as fiction founded on fact, mere extraordinary or even common occurrences which had been embellished by the excited senses and imagination of the spectators and historians of the time, like the exploits of Achilles and the adventures of Romulus. At length appeared the strictly mythological exegetes, such as De Wette, Gabler and Bauer, finding philosophic as well as historic myths successively in the Old and the New Testament, unconscious inventions of facts in accordance with traditional ideas, spontaneous creations of the Messianic fancy, then universally credited, no more actual than the story of Apollo or the feats of Hercules. At the same time, there had been growing up an idealistic philosophy from Kant to Hegel, which stood ready, after the manner of the classic mythologists, to infuse its ideas into the Christian myths as their hidden meaning and only essential truth, somewhat as Bacon, Schelling and Müller had already philosophically interpreted the Greek and Roman fables. All things seemed thus conspiring to one result. A point had been reached where German pantheists could unite with English deists and French infidels in attacking, from different quarters, the entire historical truth of the Gospel. Wollaston, Bolingbroke, Voltaire, Reimarus and Lessing might be made

to join hands with learned theologians and professed defenders of the faith. And it was then that the stealthy treason was unmasked by a young divine, since known as the infidel Dr. Strauss, of whom it has been said that he collected all the various doubts with which the historic Christ had ever been assailed and tore away the metaphysical veil that screened them from popular view, as Antony lifted the robe of Cæsar and showed the wounds which each conspirator had inflicted in the dark. Henceforth, Christianity was to be accepted not as a sheer imposture, nor yet as a true history, but simply as a gorgeous mythology which has descended to us from the twilight eras of time, gathering in its train the gray-haired patriarchs, priests and prophets, the divine Messiah and Apostles, the holy fathers, martyrs and doctors, and yet ever bearing within its bosom those eternal truths by which the saint and the philosopher alike must live.

The psychical sciences, as thus robbed of their biblical portions by the sceptical spirit, would leave us only a psychology without the Christian virtues and graces, a sociology without Providence and the Church, and a theology without Jehovah and without Christ.

Sceptical Religious Philosophy.

At length we may meet our religious sceptic on the heights of philosophy returning from his survey of the sciences only to escape their controversies and proclaim their failures in some hopeless theory of knowledge, like the spies who brought back an evil report of the giants of Canaan.

At one time, he is ready to abandon reason for the sake of revelation. That only apologetic weapon with which to defend the Divine Word is made to explode in his hands. The finitude, the inconsistency, the weakness and the depravity of the human intellect are magnified until truth is lost in paradox and faith vanishes in doubt. It was thus that Bossuet, in his "Variations of Protestantism," would have disgusted the emancipated reason with its errors and driven it back to the chair of infallibility by what Turrettin styled a sort of "Papal Pyrrhonism." It was thus that Huet sought his "Evangelical Demonstration" in the impotence of that

very human understanding to which he appealed, and Pascal would have reared his projected apology for the Christian Faith upon a Cartesian basis of universal doubt. It was thus that Glanville, in his "Scientific Scepticism," inveighed against all intuition of causes, all real knowledge as vain uncertainty and impious pretension; and Berkeley, whilst inquiring into the chief sources of error and difficulty in the sciences, laid the train through which Hume undermined the very foundations of knowledge, both divine and human. It is thus, too, in our own time, that Hamilton has arrayed the heroes of faith as martyrs of doubt at the grave of philosophy; and furnished Mansel with such narrow "Limits of Religious Thought" that he would have proved a revelation all but impossible by showing a God to be inconceivable. And the age is still full of brave, despairing thinkers, who are practically swayed by the same principle; gentle sceptics, who after pursuing through the schools the various speculative theogonies in which philosophy has striven to swallow up theology, have become appalled at her profane attempt to unfold the enigma of the universe by mere logical process, and fled for refuge to some easy creed of paradoxes retaining the mass of truths in a state of simple contradiction; the Schlegels, the Newmans, the Brownsons, the Walworths, who with Father Stone have heeded the voice of the unerring Chief Pastor, and sought repose from doubt on the bosom of Holy Mother Church.

At another time, however, the religious sceptic seems ready to abandon revelation for the sake of reason. That only infallible word of God is prejudged and forestalled by its own professed pupil. Its normal limits, its concurrent evidences, its supreme authority are questioned and diminished, until mere human reason is left as the sole arbiter of truth and judge of controversy. In this spirit, Kant prescribed as the only legitimate topic of inspiration a species of moral religion which he could find within the bounds of the pure reason; and Fichte attempted a "Criticism of all Revelation" which would have arbitrarily predetermined its whole method, spirit, and contents; and Röhr and Wegscheider made the moral reason or mere human conscience the supreme judge of what God

should teach to man. In this spirit, Paley magnified the miracles at the expense of the doctrines, and Coleridge exalted the doctrines over the miracles, as insignia of the Divine Word, until both evidential schools, as led by Mansel and Jowett, became involved in doubt and suspicion, like a divided army wrangling in front of the enemy. In this spirit, too, a long line of biblical critics, from Semler to Colenso, with their free discussion upon the Canon, have been exscinding one sacred book after another, from Genesis to the Apocalypse, as too unedifying, inconsistent, puerile, to have come from the supposed Divine Author, or alleged human writers. And in this spirit, at length, the sovereign authority of Scripture itself, as expressed in the creeds and canons of the Church, is perversely evaded or openly defied from the throne of the bishop, the pulpit of the preacher, and the chair of the divine. On all sides are restless spirits breaking away from the ancient moorings of faith; bold, but rash seekers of truth who, having been long familiar with those mystic theodiceas by which theology has but played at philosophy, at last become disgusted with her fond effort to array the universe as a mere dogmatic marvel, and lapse to some bald creed of negations, containing in itself the merest fragment of truth; a Francis Newman, a Theodore Parker, a David Strauss, passing through all the phases of faith, with but a brief suspense in doubt, to the total eclipse of unbelief.

The philosophic system issuing from such religious scepticism, if system it can be called, simply sacrifices the biblical to the scientific portions of knowledge, or retains them both in hopeless contradiction. From the day that Schleiermacher reported the distant advance of science as a new assailant of the Bible, and himself proposed to abandon the outworks in Genesis and flee into the open field of history, the shameful policy of surrender and retreat has gone on, until the crisis which he predicted would seem to have come, when such apologists must choose between deserting to the enemy or being ceremoniously interred in their own fortifications. Some English thinkers have certainly reached that juncture. The gifted Miss Cobbe, in her "Broken Lights," admits that for the extreme Broad Church, whenever the Bible contra-

dicts Science, there is no alternative but the sacrifice of biblical infallibility. Baden Powell and Jowett have already given up the Hebrew Scriptures in order to save the Christian; as if (said Mendelssohn, when advised to recant Judaism for Christianity) one should flee into the second story while the first is in flames. The Rev. Stanley T. Gibson, in his work on "Religion and Science," maintains that the real schism between them is in the still more fundamental region of natural theology, where he unsettles the supporting arguments of Paley and Butler, concerning the wisdom and goodness of the Creator. The Rev. T. W. Fowle, in his "Reconciliation of Religion and Science," maintains that all the methods, dogmas and creeds of Christianity must pass under the yoke of scientific inquiry and continue to exist only so far as science permits and approves, and that with the death of the old theology will begin the new religion. The Duke of Somerset, in his "Christian Theology and Modern Scepticism," has sought to expose the human elements of error which in the course of ages have become mixed with the whole doctrinal system of Christianity, and maintains that it is waning before some better day, when the sectarian bodies and lower orders shall have participated in the religious culture of the higher classes. Mr. Matthew Arnold, in his treatise on "Literature and Dogma," avers that already the whole existing theological interpretation of the Bible is but a tradition of the clergy, which has lost its hold upon the people, and that a better apprehension of it can only be gained by means of that large, generous culture which shall concentrate upon it the best thoughts of the best minds in all time, and thus unfold its only essential and universal truths.

The French, the Swiss, the Dutch schools of religious scepticism are but repeating the same strain with variations. Numerous American authors of essays, sermons and reviews on the relations of Science and Revelation, are only incautiously beginning a new cycle with swifter movement, at the outer rim of the vortex, by conceding that the Bible in which they believe, teaches physical errors in connection with its moral and spiritual truths; as if its ethics and theology can be retained after its astronomy and geology have been

abandoned. And other more scientific investigators seem only to perceive and announce the growing antagonism, while contributing but little to the work of harmony. Dr. Draper has ably sketched the "History of the Great Conflict between Science and Religion," without also retracing their great alliances, and concludes with the hope that Reformed Christianity may yet be reconciled with advancing science by carrying out the Lutheran maxim of private interpretation with absolute freedom of thought. President White has omitted from his brilliant annals of the "Warfare of Science" any account of the assaults upon religion, and in view of the fact that science is destined to modify the dominant religious conceptions of the world, suggests that influential religious persons should make the adjustment as quietly and speedily as possible.

And the dispiriting effect of such scepticism is seen in a large, increasing class of speculative minds who, amid the doubt and distraction of the age, have begun to despair of any intelligent concurrence of reason and revelation, and to abandon all attempts at a logical organization of scientific and biblical knowledge. They are among the finest, most cultured spirits of the time. Naturally of a reflective habit, with an innate hungering and thirsting after certain knowledge, and a dauntless spirit of research, which are among the noblest auguries of success, they have yearned after some theory and system which shall give unity and form to their fragmentary belief and information. In search of this loved ideal they traverse one after another the different sciences; they scale height after height of shadowy speculation; they pass, with patient initiation, from school to school of philosophy; they describe the whole circuit of vagaries, by turns rejecting and maintaining the most opposite premises, and familiarizing themselves to the most absurd conclusions, until at length all proper conditions of faith are unsettled in their minds. Granting nothing, denying nothing, doubting everything, they have lost that healthy appetite for realities, that wholesome relish for facts, which belonged to them ere they had run such a course of intellectual dissipation, and become like the sated voluptuary with the world's pleasures palling upon his taste.

A shade of mournful suspicion and disgust gathers over the whole field of thought, lately so glowing with the splendors of their discursive imagination; and there is nothing left them but the dirge of the preacher over the weariness of study, the multiplicity of books, and the vanity of all human wisdom.

The sceptical philosophy, which would thus divide and distract the body of knowledge by tearing its biblical from its scientific members, can no more prove itself the true mother of science, than could the woman at the court of Solomon make good her right to the child which she was ready to have cut in twain before her eyes.

Effete Religious Culture.

At the last, the sceptical spirit may be seen emerging in practical life with a despairing view of all the different spheres of Christian civilization, as but like so many once fair provinces that have been abandoned to decay and ruin.

In the midst of our boasted culture, some leading minds have been discerning the signs of moral decrepitude and death. The Chevalier Bunsen speaks of the novels of Victor Hugo, Balzac, Dumas, and Eugene Sue as expressing the despairing consciousness of an unbelieving age which would use religion only as a spice of fiction; of the modern opera as clothing the spectre of despair in the rags of mediæval piety, with organs on the stage in place of flutes, hymns for sentimental songs, processions of monks and nuns instead of military shows; and of the rococo style in painting, which would hypocritically and satirically combine the pig-tail of Louis XV. with the angelic faces conceived by Giotto and Perugino. Thomas Carlyle would seem to look upon all the rapid movements of modern civilization as but the rush towards a "Niagara" of ruin; Mr. Greg even discerns the "rocks ahead" in the moral, political, and social perils of the time; and Mr. Matthew Arnold imagines us already whelmed in an "anarchy," from which only some new form of culture can deliver us. And these voices of alarmists are but interpreted by the religious sceptic as indications of a general and seated decay of every great human interest.

He has no faith in any regeneration of literature. He

remembers that the revival of letters by Boccaccio and Erasmus simply blended Pagan with Christian culture, and that Protestantism has ever since been declining from its own earlier literary models. The earnest believing ages which produced the chaste fervor of the English liturgy, the solemn grandeur of the Paradise Lost, the demure grace of Pilgrim's Progress, the quaint saintliness of the Temple, and the didactic strains of the Task and Night Thoughts have been followed by the mocking scepticism of Faust, the subtle atheism of Queen Mab, the defiant unbelief of Cain, the daring impiety of Festus, the blasphemous scoffs of Heine, and all the irreverent wit and satire discharged at the godly faith of purer days. If we have had the natural piety of Thomson, Wordsworth and Bryant, we now have also the gross naturalism of Swinburne, Walt Whitman and Joaquin Miller. And the very muse of Christian devotion has begun to trail her white robe in the mire. That fastidious dislike of evangelical phraseology which Foster and Chalmers criticised in men of taste has become justified, in his view, by a new gospel of slang, which soils Holy Scripture with impure English, takes its text from the newspaper, draws its parables from stale anecdotes and vulgar incidents and admits the colloquial freedom of common life into the sacred realm of prayer and worship. It is not in the Sunday-school novel, the proselyting tract, the polemic treatise, the religious journal, that he discerns the signs of any classical revival for which he may long; and he can only sigh over a former age of Christian literature that will never return.

As little faith has he in any religious regeneration of art. He does not forget that she was of Pagan rather than Christian birth; that she ceased to be Grecian in becoming Gothic; and that then her most splendid trophies were the direct fruit of a religious system which for three centuries has been on the wane. Other and grosser interests now claim the wealth, genius and labor once so piously lavished upon the magnificent cathedral with its sacred treasures of painting, sculpture, music and oratory. The new æsthetical Christianity that would reclaim such lost appliances is but decking itself in borrowed finery and parading as a mere spectacular

form what was once only the due artistic expression of an earnest faith. It has no architects to design its fit temple, no painters to depict its story, no sculptors to image forth its saints, no Bernards and Massillons to give it eloquent voice. Even the few simple graces, retained by the highest Protestant culture, have long since widely degenerated into a plainer worship. The majestic liturgy with its solemn litany and collects, its grand old chants and hallowed hymns, has given place to the sensational sermon with a prelude of wandering prayers and pious jigs and glees. He can find no germs of a new Christian art in the rudeness which does not crave it or in the culture that for the lack of it is hopelessly reverting to pagan and papal ideals that belong only to the past.

> "The famous orators have done,
> The famous poets sung and gone,
> The famous speculators thought,
> The famous players, sculptors, wrought,
> The famous painters filled their wall,
> The famous critics judged it all."

Still less faith has he in any Christian element in politics. He recalls the union of the Church with the State under Constantine, and of the State with the Church under Hildebrand as examples of the inevitable failure of all theocratic experiments. And the separate development of Church and State since the Reformation has but wrought a breach in modern society, which he sees no method of healing. As a churchman, he deplores the loss of those ecclesiastical functions which were designed to conserve and purify all human institutions. As a statesman, he laments the decay of public virtue in high places, the diminished respect for kings and nobles, the shameless corruption of republics, and the brute ignorance and vice which soon pervade the purest democracies. And as a socialist, any youthful dreams he may have cherished of a new ideal commonwealth of the future, have long since faded away and left him the mere hardened cynic who sneers at the present social state as a sort of tragic farce; or the fatalist who dooms it to certain vast cycles of natural growth and decay, and pensively sighs over the grandeur and

decadence of nations, states and empires as but the melancholy lesson of all history.

At last he loses all hope of any complete triumph of the Christian religion itself. It has but followed Judaism as one divine economy succeeds another, with no elements of self-perpetuation; and even Protestantism, though vigorously resisting the corruptions of Catholicism for a time, begins to show signs of disintegration and decay. The high thinking and plain living of a former age have been reversed, and that superangelic pietism which fancied itself ready to suffer eternal perdition for the divine glory, after paling into an intellectual transcendentalism or metaphysical orthodoxy, has at length vanished in mere Horatian culture and Epicurean luxury. And if he may have indulged in any speculations as to some future absolute religion in which all others are to be merged, he has soon found them superficial and visionary, and become the religious pessimist who regards defect and evil as inherent in the whole finite creation, or the ascetic who rejects humanity as hopelessly corrupt and irredeemable, and turns away from the whole existing civilization with all its accumulated arts, sciences and politics as so much splendid rubbish of sin soon to be wrecked in the flames of a vast judicial conflagration.

Thus the despondent sceptics on both sides are falling into apathy, and would alike paralyze all effort. If they can be said to admit a question between science and religion, it is only to adjourn it at once to another life, or reduce it to a nullity; while the whole existing civilization and Christianity they would treat as simply experimental and abortive.

Against this last and most specious of the errors under review, it only remains to urge that the prospective must grow out of the existing relations of reason and revelation. Though neither seems now in full harmony with the other, yet both are in an actual process of reconciliation. Far distant as may appear their coincidence, yet we are at least at its beginnings, and may already strive for its accomplishment. The despair that, on account of some first failures, would abandon it, or postpone it to an ideal heaven or remote future dispensation, is to be resisted for several reasons:

In the first place, the spirit of such scepticism is weak and ignoble. What if it be true, that all present knowledge must soon be lost in beatific vision, or be eclipsed by millennial glory, or is at best but confused and meagre; shall we therefore despise it, and make no effort to purge and increase it? Had the generations before us so thought and acted, where now would have been the Christianity and civilization that adorn our era? So long as we are on the earth, and members of the race it nourishes, it will be a high duty, as well as instinct, to swell the tide of truth in all lands through all time. Better far to toil after even an impossible ideal of knowledge, than to sink in supine ignorance; better to yearn after the boundless unknown as ever knowable, than basely to despair of it as unknowable. The worthy aim and rational goal of science is not nescience but omniscience.

In the second place, the premises of such scepticism are narrow and unfounded. Because religion and science are as yet imperfect and discordant, it does not follow that reason and revelation themselves are defective and in need of some miraculous readjustment. We cannot, in fact, conceive of any better or any other modes of cognition than those with which we are now familiar. A future state, wherein the soul is to seize the whole infinitude of truth by one swift intuition, or in one blazing apocalypse, is but the dream of a mystical fancy. As the Infinite Mind has been gradual in unfolding the universe, so must the finite mind be gradual in reviewing it; and if the Creator passes through chaos to cosmos in the process of creation, shall not the creature, retracing that process, be ofttimes worn and bewildered ere he reach the vision and sabbath of perfect knowledge? It would seem to result from their logical relations to one another, that it is the function of the finite reason to recapitulate the Infinite Reason; that in this endless effort after the divine rationale of the universe, the sciences must ever proceed as now by joint revelation and experience, and in the order of the creative logic, from the simpler to the more complex phenomena, each resuming that which is behind it and requiring that which is before it; that since this problem of creation, upon which they are engaged, has immensity for its scene and eternity for its scope,

both celestial and terrestrial races are embarked in the mighty argument on the basis of their present material and spiritual relations; and that there can be no pause nor retreat in their progress, but only an eternal approximation of that fulness of knowledge which shall be gained, when all the worlds of space shall have given up their secrets and all the ages of time shall have unfolded their marvels, and God shall be all in all.

In the third place, such scepticism ignores past progress. Appalled at the vastness of the unknown, it overlooks the known and is blind to the immense advance of the present over former generations. The actual history of the sciences shows that it is only during their imperfect stages of development that they come into seeming conflict with revelation; that in their issue, through their own discoveries, they but authenticate the facts and prove the truths of Scripture; and that by the very law of their successive evolution they involve a logical unfolding of the Infinite by the finite reason and a cumulative vindication of the divine attributes in the order of their manifestation and dignity, from that science which discovers to us a Celestial Mechanician, infinite in power, up to that which may yet disclose to us a Celestial Father, infinite in love. Astronomy has already emerged from the mists of infidel criticism with an overwhelming exhibition of the God of Scripture as also the God of Nature, and the reasonable presumption is that the whole train of the sciences in their normal order will follow, until the entire Deity as revealed shall be also demonstrated; the illustration of His natural attributes afforded by physics at length finding its crown and complement in a still more glorious illustration of His moral attributes through the psychical sciences. Even geology may yet only elucidate Genesis, and sociology forecast the apocalypse; the one by a scientific revision of the course of nature and the other by a scientific prevision of the course of humanity. And when at length the terrestrial physics and ethics are thus complete, there will be the means of projecting that system of celestial physics and ethics, through which to mount with growing knowledge and faith, in endless progression, toward the perfection of omniscience itself. To suppose that this grand

series could be rudely broken by a miraculous millennium and so much of it as already lies in the past left without its logical sequel and complement in the future, would be to suppose an anomaly for which all nature could afford no analogy, precedent or palliation.

In the fourth place, such scepticism mistakes the present social exigency. Through all ages the populace has craved prodigies and catastrophes, rather than the ordinary means of Providence, for the world's regeneration, and can still think of no better corrective of its existing moral and intellectual evils than some new divine economy to be forced upon it by means of destructive judgments, involving vast planetary convulsions or political revolutions. In this respect the religious despondent differs from the religious eclectic only in seeking a miraculous rather than an artificial reconstruction of society. It may be vain to argue against such a defect of thought, blended as it often is with the purest faith and zeal; and yet there will, notwithstanding, always be those, having like faith and zeal, whom it fails to satisfy, and who are content to look for a millennium which shall be an intelligible triumph of the Divine Reason through the human reason over all error and sin; a growing demonstration of revealed truth, before which all false opinions and institutions shall slowly fade away like mists and clouds of sunrise, until the whole race is transfigured and the earth full of the glory of God.

This hopeful view is more in keeping with the analogies of prophecy. No principle is plainer than that the transition of prophecy into history appears violent and dramatic only in prospect. As the Christian economy quietly resumed and carried forward the Hebrew economy, so the millennial economy may prove to be but the existing human world as matured and perfected. And even if a destruction of the present physical system be within the scope of Scripture and of nature, it would seem that it could only be with a view to some more glorious moral reconstruction, whereby the whole past shall be taken up again into the future, even as Providence has already erected the modern out of the antediluvian world, and yet left both the individual and the social constitution of the race unimpaired.

The same view is more in keeping with the analogies of history. All philosophic historians are beginning to conceive of the career of humanity as spiral rather than circular, marked by average progression rather than mere fruitless recurrences and aimless repetitions. Great men may live and die, empires may rise and fall, whole civilizations may flourish and decay; but the race itself, inheriting and transmitting from one generation to another, always survives and, Phœnix-like, springs for bolder flights and grander prospects. Hebrew, Greek, and Roman ideas are still powerful in modern society, though the nations which wrought them out have ages since perished. Can we believe in the face of six thousand years of such progress that the social system is to be arrested and destroyed? After all the advance that has been made in the long lapse of time, will any millennium appear too distant or utopian to have its growth out of even this present disordered world?

The same view is demanded by the organism of society. According to that organism, the progress of the arts depends upon the progress of the sciences, and the former come to fruition in the order of the latter. Already the material arts are shedding a millennial splendor in the marvels of printing, steam and telegraphy, while the remaining series begin to presage the decline of caste, war and superstition, through the agency of commerce, diplomacy and philanthropy. And it enters into the very notion of social regeneration, that this organism of society should continue to be developed until its ideal is fully realized in a perfected Christian art, science and polity, and the whole race intellectually, morally and physically transformed. Upon any other terms, a millennium, properly speaking, is simply inconceivable, if not impossible.

And the same view harmonizes the otherwise conflicting interests which science and religion have fostered. Instead of abandoning both or postponing both to some vague hereafter, it begins at once to practically unite the natural and the supernatural, the terrestrial and the celestial, the human and the divine. Heaven is found to be but the full flower of earth. The kingdom of the heavens (as the Greek may be rendered) is that realm of planets, suns and stars, to which the earth is

both spiritually and materially linked, of which now we have some scientific hints from celestial mechanics and chemistry, but which shall yet be more fully unfolded by celestial sociology and theology as the abode of our Father who is in the heavens, and of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named. The world to come is to be thought of as being historically developed out of the world that now is, and the life of the individual so bound up in the life of the race, that both have their resurrection together, whensoever the spiritual shall so predominate over the material forces of the planet as to transfigure it into an abode of truth and righteousness. Even the coming of the Son of Man to judge both quick and dead, and the triumphal meeting of saints and angels in the skies may be viewed as not less a crisis than a pageant; the rational blending of the earthly into the heavenly history; the glorious appearing of a new, redeemed orb amid the sisterhood of worlds; the winged globe bursting from its chrysalis and blazoning its cross among the stars.

We may therefore conclude, after a full survey of all modern philosophical opinions, that the two great interests of religion and science are not only reconcileable, but actually being reconciled. Let neither the scientist nor the religionist despair of their ultimate harmony, but rather let both strive together to effect it, and therein hail at once the thorough fusion of Christianity and civilization and the practical union of earth and heaven.

PART SECOND.

THE PHILOSOPHICAL THEORY

OF THE

HARMONY

OF

SCIENCE AND RELIGION.

CHAPTER I.

THE UMPIRAGE OF PHILOSOPHY BETWEEN SCIENCE AND RELIGION.

It is a preliminary task which Philosophy exacts from her votaries, before entering upon any grave inquiry, to cleanse the mind by means of pure thoughts and strict definitions. If the mere novice is apt to disdain such discipline as irksome or needless, he soon finds that without it he cannot hope to penetrate to her inmost mysteries, or will invade the oracle only to be perplexed and abashed by its responses.

There is especial need of all the philosophic virtues in approaching the great question which is now before us. We have seen that for more than three centuries the civilized world has been agitated by an unnatural strife between the scientific and the religious classes. Many battles have been fought; much learning and research on both sides expended; and already some substantial advantages gained. Religion has grown more tolerant of scientific opinion; science has shed new light upon religious truth; and the salutary lessons of their former controversies are not yet spent in other fields of inquiry. But after all, what progress has been made toward a settlement of the general question involved in such conflicts? How much nearer are we to a final philosophy or accepted theory of the reciprocal relations of reason and revelation, of science and religion? What broad surveys have we of their distinct provinces and common ground? What clear discriminations of their respective methods and laws, and of their logical and historical interaction? And what systematic

attempts at harmonizing and organizing the existing bodies of knowledge which they have developed? Must not every enlightened observer admit that the field of controversy has been widening rather than contracting; that the state of parties throughout that field grows more involved and serious; and that the tenor of the strife is already critical? And is it to be maintained that this is the normal or final relationship of the two interests? Are they of necessity and always mutually indifferent, antagonistic, exterminating? Or, do they admit of gradual reunion, coincidence and harmony? These are questions which begin to force themselves upon thoughtful minds. They not only invite, but require and deserve consideration. Their very difficulty and delicacy are overborne by their urgency.

And what makes the great reconciliation still more imperative is the growing conviction which has been all along latent in many minds on both sides of the question, that the whole conflict is needless, if not unreal, and largely due to the false issues and misleading phrases of mere professional tactics. It was one of the trenchant sayings of Dr. Johnson that the apologetical divines of his time had so managed the evidences of Christianity as to put the apostles on trial for forgery every night. Professor Maurice agrees with "A Layman" to whom he writes, in censuring those weaker brethren who struggle to protect the Bible from the last new theory propounded at the British Association, and are thrown into ignominious rapture or terror by the favorable or unfavorable comments of any distinguished member of that body. At the same time, veteran scientists, like Agassiz, Gray, Henry and Lionel Beale, have deplored the needless effort of some of the younger naturalists to dispense with all theistic conceptions in their researches, and the still more unwarrantable attempt of others to impose upon the laity certain atheistic and materialistic speculations which have never been received within the profession as scientific verities. Bishop Berkeley, in his sketch of the Minute Philosopher, would seem to have anticipated a race of brilliant and accomplished savants of our day, who would eschew the pedantry of a college education and make an irreligious form of science fashionable and popular

by means of instructive lectures, seasoned with wit and raillery and uttered with spirit; a sort of sect which diminish all the most valuable things, the thoughts, views, and hopes of men; all the knowledge, notions, and theories of the mind they reduce to sense; human nature they contract and degrade to the narrow, low standard of animal life, and assign us only a small pittance of time instead of immortality; and when they are charged with these opinions, they very gravely remark that they have done no injury to man, since if he be a little, short-lived, contemptible animal, it was not their saying it made him so. "Be it ours," —says the eloquent Dean of Westminster, in a recent address at St. Andrews, on the reconciliation of theology and science, "to fasten our thoughts not on the passions and parties of the brief to-day, but on the hopes of the long to-morrow. The day, the year, may perchance belong to the destructives, the cynics, and the partizans; but the morrow, the coming century, belongs to the catholic, comprehensive, discriminating, all-embracing Christianity which has the promise, not of this present time, but of the times which are to be."

We believe that the mass of scientific and religious men are not to be found in any of the parties which have been delineated; neither among the Extremists, who would put religion and science at variance, nor among the Indifferentists, who would disjoin and seclude them; nor yet among the Eclectics who would blend them illogically, nor still less among the Sceptics who despair of their reconciliation. Rather is there a general persuasion of their essential harmony and a feeling that the time has already come to insist upon that harmony as the normal state of their relations; to raise this imaginary siege and blockade of "evidences" and "apologetics" by which for some time past they have been estranged and divided; to dwell upon their ancient alliances rather than their transient conflicts, and proclaim a just peace amid their seeming warfare; in a word, to lift the standard of that catholic, conclusive philosophy which shall intelligently embrace them both in a rational coalescence, shall ascertain and formulate the terms of their lasting amity, gather their blended trophies, canonize their saints and heroes, and cele-

brate their mutual victories, for the divine glory and human welfare.

And we shall need to enter upon this part of the treatise with a brief survey of the present state of the sciences, from a philosophical point of view. Without such a survey we cannot hope to understand the precise work to be done in harmonizing and organizing them. Indeed, as Whewell and Comte have shown, it is only by a careful study of the sciences themselves that we can reach their true philosophy or that science of the sciences which they must yield as their last and noblest fruitage. It is only from a knowledge of their past growth and present condition that we can forecast their future progress. Now, it will be shown in the next volume, that each of them, since the Reformation, has broken into two sections, the one mainly scientific and the other largely religious, and that these two sections in parting from each other have proceeded through three distinct stages; the first, a stage of healthful separation and progress, marked by ascertained facts and truths; the second, a stage of mutual avoidance, filled with conflicting hypotheses and dogmas; and the third, a stage of open rupture issuing in antagonistic speculations and beliefs. It is to the second of these stages that we are to confine our attention in this chapter. Leaving out of view those portions of knowledge which have attained to scientific certainty and are no longer in debate, those discovered facts and laws which alone make positive science, we shall find remaining to be considered a mass of unsolved problems, mostly questions of origin and destiny, which are growing more complex every hour, and before which the religious and scientific champions of our day are crossing lances, like the two knights before the mystic shield, with their respective hypotheses and dogmas in a more or less contradictory state. It will be our first task to survey the opposite sides or phases of these questions, as expressed in such dogmas and hypotheses, from an independent position, in a strictly philosophical mood, without prejudging them in the slightest degree, and with an effort to do each of them the utmost justice. We shall then have the whole case before us, with the materials for a full and fair decision.

Let it therefore be carefully noted, once for all, that the hypotheses and dogmas which are held respecting scientific questions are now coming before us in their pure and simple form, without any admixture with each other, and as enunciated by the highest authorities. Among both scientists and religionists, as we have seen in previous chapters, may be found many who seek to blend the theories of science with the doctrines of religion, as well as some who would put them apart or at variance. But such classes do not now come within our survey, as our present object is simply to recall and briefly recapitulate those problematical portions of each science, which are of a hypothetical and a dogmatic nature, and which together form the debatable ground between the two parties to be reconciled.

Problems in the Physical Sciences.

Astronomy—to begin with the oldest of the concrete sciences—still offers to the two parties that ever present problem which has tasked our race for thousands of years, the origin of the heavens, the production of those mysterious bodies, the sun, planets, and satellites, the stars, galaxies, and nebulæ which fill the immensity of space around us. On the scientific side of this question, we have the hypothesis of universal evolution, of a spontaneous growth of worlds out of crude matter, by means of its own laws, from an indefinite immensity and antiquity; in a word, the rise of the present cosmos from a primitive chaos. It is an hypothesis as old as the fortuitous atoms of Democritus and Epicurus; and though it slumbered during the early and middle ages until it was revived by Bruno and Gassendi in the seventeenth century, it has since come forth again with renewed vigor and in more scientific forms. Descartes led the way with his original plenum of vortices, forming and whirling the sun and planets, in vast concentric eddies of different kinds of matter. Kant followed with his primitive chaos of attractive and repulsive particles, massing into revolving globes and poising themselves in the equilibrium of the planetary forces, according to the Newtonian principles of mechanics. La Place at length completed such views with his magnificent postulate of a

universal nebula or fire-mist, eddying into a central igneous body like the sun, and then breaking into rotating rings, cooling into cloudy and watery spheres, hardening into solid shells, like the different planets of the solar system. The elder Herschel pushed this sublime speculation with the telescope into the sidereal heavens among the nebulous masses which were there supposed to be forming themselves into other suns, planets, and systems. And by many living authorities it is now claimed that the nebular theory, as confirmed by the spectroscope, enables us to trace the different phases of cosmic growth in the heavens as plainly as any organic process upon earth.

On the religious side of the same question we have the dogma of immediate creation, of an instantaneous starting forth of the heavens and earth from nothing, in their present form, at the mere word of Jehovah. It is a dogma dating from the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures, and in various terms has been formulated and handed down to us by the rabbis, the fathers, the schoolmen, the reformers, and the divines of the following age. Philo, the Platonic Jew, in agreement with the Maccabees, held that the worlds were not formed from anything pre-existent, but spoken into being by the Divine Word. St. Augustine taught that the Deity fashioned the heavens and earth not out of matter, nor yet out of Himself, but of nothing, by an instantaneous exertion of His own free will. St. Aquinas followed with the scholastic distinction, that God from eternity willed that the world should be, and not that the world should be from eternity. Calvin stigmatized as a profane jeer the inquiry why the heavens and earth should have been created only six thousand years ago, after so many idle ages had rolled away and with so much vacant space left running to waste. The great body of living divines following these different authorities in the Jewish, Greek, Roman Catholic, and Protestant Churches, still teach and confess the same dogma; and at this hour it stands defined in the same terms as when the heavens were but admired as a blue canopy or illuminated dome.

Besides the origin of the heavens, the question of their destiny, so long a mere theme of devout fancy, is becoming

also a problem of exact science. It was taught by all the great doctors, poets and artists, from the days of Clement, Bernard, and Angelo, that the whole existing firmament might at any moment be destroyed and renewed by the flames of a general conflagration in order to become the pure abode of saints and angels; and even since the rise of astronomical conceptions, the comet, the meteor, and the aurora have ever and anon been hailed as portents of judgment and signs of the approaching kingdom of heaven. But we are now assured, on the authority of leading physicists, such as Grove, Helmholtz, and Tyndall, that so far as science can yet foresee, the advancing evolution can only issue in gradual dissolution; that the potential forces of heat, light, and life, which have been stored from the primitive nebula, or from surrounding meteors in star, sun, and planet, as the ages roll on, will inevitably be spent, and the whole machinery of the heavens fall back into ruins; that already the moon is but a charred cinder of the earth, the earth a cooling ember of the sun, the sun a blazing fragment of the stars, the stars themselves but dying suns, and all their galaxies doomed to pale and wane into universal night and death.

The design of the heavens, the habitability of other worlds and their mutual relations, the possibility of life and intelligence throughout the universe, are also emerging questions of like double import. While the one party, from Dionysius and Gregory to Chalmers, have imagined an ascending hierarchy of angels, principalities and powers, rank above rank, through the heaven of heavens toward the throne of Jehovah; the other party, from Plutarch and Kepler to Whewell, can discern in the stars, sun, and planets only so many globes of fire, vapor and slag, wholly incapable of sustaining life and reason, and as destitute of any intelligible purpose as the crystals that sparkle or the flowers that bloom where no eye can ever see them. And the concluding question as to the goal or aim of the whole cosmic process has at length issued in the extreme opinions of Jonathan Edwards and Herbert Spencer; on the one hand, that of a miraculous creation and regeneration of the heavens and earth at fixed epochs for the good of creatures and the glory of their Creator; on the

other hand, that of a rhythmic ebb and flow of ever-persistent force from nebula to planet and planet to nebula, from chaos to cosmos and cosmos to chaos, through endless cycles of evolving and dissolving worlds, appearing and disappearing like the drops which sparkle in a sunset-cloud.

Geology next meets us with problems scarcely less grand and even more interesting, such as the origin of our own planet, the formation of the rocky layers which inclose its hidden contents, and the growth of the fossil plants and animals which are found buried in its crust. On the one side of the question is the hypothesis of secular evolution, of a slow unfolding of the globe from a chaotic mass into its organized form, through the action of existing causes, during indefinite time. If any germs of such an hypothesis can be traced in the mundane egg of Orpheus and Aristophanes, the primitive fire and water of Heraclitus and Thales and the speculations of Strabo upon floods and volcanos, they remained buried under dogmatic traditions during the middle ages until they were again brought forth by the early Italian geologists, and at length cast into a more scientific shape. Leibnitz and Buffon fancied the primitive earth a sort of extinguished fragment of the sun with a volcanic nucleus and universal ocean, through whose joint action its seas and continents were formed. Werner and Hutton, as founders of the rival schools of Neptunists and Vulcanists, traced the aqueous and igneous strata to the same causes which are still producing alluvium and lava, though at a rate that would require an immeasurable past. Lamarck and G. St. Hilaire broached theories of animal transmutation, serving to blend through long epochs the fossil and living species which Cuvier would have broken apart with his successive deluges. Herschel and Poisson, in like manner, sought to transform ancient into modern climates by means of celestial causes of inconceivable slowness, such as a swaying of the earth's orbit and poles in the solar rays, a fluctuation of heat and light in the sun itself, and even radiation among the stars. Babbage and Lyell traced the secular changes of climate and species to more terrestrial causes, such as the decline of the earth's primitive heat and the gradual shifting of the continents by the action

of its crust. Humboldt, bringing these facts together into a comprehensive review, has sketched the progressive stages of our planet as at first a nebulous ring, then an incandescent sphere, and at length a granite shell sustaining between the central fire and solar heat the successive kingdoms of organic life which have flourished and decayed upon its surface. Most living geologists and palæontologists seem to proceed upon some such hypothesis; and by the advanced school according to Professor Huxley, it is held to be not unlikely that the whole development of the globe through all its eras and phases may yet be traced as plainly as the growth of a fowl within the egg.

On the religious side of the same question is the dogma of successive creations, of Almighty fiats calling into being one after another land and sea and sky, reptiles and plants and animals in six days of twenty-four hours, a few thousand years ago. Although derived from the Mosaic Genesis, it is a dogma which has varied its terms with each age of the Church. The early fathers, Clement and Origen, treated the six days as sacred allegories rather than literal epochs. The later fathers Athanasius and Augustine termed them the mere timeless acts of an instantaneous creation, successive only in our thought, and figuratively represented to us as working days measured by sunrise and sunset. The schoolmen, Hugh of St. Victor and Peter Lombard, defined them as miraculous works which might indeed have been performed all at once, as the fathers taught, but in fact were produced successively, in six literal days, as religious lessons of the Creator to His creatures. The Westminster divines also held them to be periods of twenty-four hours, and found their rationale in the seven-fold division of time in six days of work with one of worship. Archbishop Usher, by act of Parliament, fixed the date of Creation on the 25th of October, 4004, B. C., and the learned Dr. Gill particularized the name as well as date of each creative day from Monday morning to Saturday night. Living divines who still follow these different authorities have as yet made no new definitions of the dogma, and for anything that appears in our existing creeds, the interminable strata, floras and faunas which geologists have been unfolding,

are still to be viewed as only so many didactic miracles wrought in a single week.

The destiny of the globe is also becoming a scientific as well as a religious question. It formed part of the ancient faith as matured by Augustine and Aquinas and depicted in the sacred arts, that our earth, having once been cleansed by water for the sin of man, would yet be purged by fire for his redemption, at a given signal when the Purgatory beneath it should send forth its flames. And even some of the early geologists, such as Hooke and Ray, looked upon the earthquake and the volcano as agents, no less than presages, of such a catastrophe. But we are now told, in accordance with the views of Fourier, Thomson, and Mayer, that the earth is already oxidated or burnt through its crust halfway to the core; that it has grown so cool in the course of ages that it could not now melt a layer of ice ten feet thick in a hundred years; and that the lunar tides which act as brakes upon the rotatory motion imparted by its primordial heat must in time cause it to spin more slowly and feebly, until at length it shall flutter upon its axis as a dead world like the moon, ever turning the same pallid face to the sun.

And the remaining question as to the end or scope of the whole terrestrial development at length lands us between the contrasted views of Burnet and Lyell; on the one side that of a miraculous deluge and conflagration of the earth between the epochs of creation and judgment, for the sake of man alone; and on the other side that of vast periodic changes of climate and species as the globe heaves and shifts its continents and seas through the great year of the zodiac, or nods to and from the sun, crowned with verdure and capped with snow every other twelve thousand years, or mayhap journeys with the sun itself among the stars through a sidereal summer and winter, from an igneous to a glacial epoch, between which our rolling seasons are flitting like the brief hours of a summer day.

Anthropology, at this point, comes forward with problems still more complex and momentous, such as the origin of our race, the first appearance of man upon the earth, and the mode of his connection with the organic scale. On the scientific side

of the question rises before us the hypothesis of derivative evolution, of a gradual growth of animal into human species, under organic and climatic laws, long ages ere history was born. It is an opinion which first figured in the mythology of the Greeks and Romans, the speculations of Epicurus, and the satires of Horace, which reappeared in the ironical pleasantries of Monboddo and De Maillet, and has at length in our day passed into a grave controversy of science. Lamarck imagined transmutations of species to have occurred through the long eras and stages of an organic progression, by the instinctive efforts of animals to adjust themselves to new conditions, the stranded turtle growing into the tortoise, the high-browsing camel into the giraffe, and even the upright orang into civilized man. The elder Darwin, the author of the "Vestiges," and Richard Owen, without committing themselves to any theory, held the existence of some purely natural law of organic development to be probable. Hooker and Wallace have at length proposed, as such a law for the vegetal and animal world, the survival of the best or fittest breeds in the struggle for subsistence which is ever going on among the teeming populations of nature. Mr. Charles Darwin, conjecturing that man himself may thus have fought his way upward from the inferior races, has been collecting the inherited proofs of such origin from his embryonic stages, his rudimental organs, and his very physiognomy. Professor Huxley has suggested that even his highest faculties of feeling and intellect may be seen germinating in some of the lower species with which he is most nearly connected. Professor Hæckel declares that, in the course of his organic life, from the germ to the grave, he epitomizes all the successive types of the palæontological scale. And Sir Charles Lyell already looks for his pedigree in the entombed dynasties of nature, among such typical shapes as the proudest nobles still blazon for their crests. It is frequently said that the majority of living naturalists accept the hypothesis in its different forms, or at least the principle upon which it proceeds, and they would doubtless agree with a saying attributed to Schaaffhausen, that the secular transformation of animal into human species, if once proved, could be no more marvelous

to science than the simplest metamorphosis of an egg into a bird or of a child into a man.

On the other side of the same question stands the dogma of independent creation, of an immediate formation of man, out of the ground, in the image of God, on the sixth day of the first week of the world. It has come down to us through various forms of statement, from the earliest comments on the writings of Moses. The rabbins, from the son of Sirach to Philo, delighted to depict the divine image in Adam as reflecting every conceivable perfection of body and mind. The fathers Tertullian, Chrysostom, and Augustine discerned it in his godlike aspect and dominion, in his intellectual and moral faculties, and in a miniature trinity of his body, soul, and spirit. The schoolmen St. Bernard, Lombard, and Scotus distinguished it into that intellectual image which even in Gehenna cannot be consumed, and that moral likeness which he lost by the fall. The later doctors Bellarmin and Suarez described such moral likeness as a paradisaic dowry which he had forfeited, a virginal wreath of which he had been despoiled. The reformers Luther and Calvin, the Puritans Owen and Edwards, re-defined it as a physical, intellectual, and moral likeness which has been wholly lost or marred, and can only be supernaturally restored. No existing body of divines has since thought of retouching these ancient symbols; and at the present moment, while anthropologists on all sides are mining into the fossil flora and fauna coeval with primitive man, our reigning dogmatic conceptions are still as crude and vague as the fancies of sacred artists and poets.

The development of mankind, the rise of races, languages, and arts, is a further question which science begins to share with religion. It has been the traditional faith, from the time of Augustine, that the human species, being potentially folded in Adam, fell with him from Paradise, became whelmed in a universal flood, were renewed from the loins of Noah, and afterward dispersed over the earth by a miraculous confusion of language into nations and tribes, with an ever-lapsing or perverted civilization. And until very lately, scientific anthropologists were retracing all existing races to Shem, Ham, and Japhet; all living dialects to the primitive Hebrew, and all

remaining monuments and traditions to the Tower of Babel. But we are now threatened with a total revolution of these opinions. Ethnologists such as Agassiz, Morton, and Owen have been grouping mankind into indigenous races, through all the hues of climate, from the Ethiopian sable to the rose of Circassia; grading them in distinct classes, by all degrees of the facial angle, from the low forehead of the ape to the profile of the Caucasian; and following them backward from one epoch to another beyond the time of Moses, through all the dynasties of the Pharaohs. Philologists such as Wilhelm Humboldt, Max Müller, and Schleicher have been unfolding human speech into its formative stages, the radical, the agglutinate, the amalgamate; tracing its roots to imitative sounds or natural cries, and even expanding its growth through long eras of fossil dialects, rudimentary letters and phonetic types, between the extremes of animal and human expression, from the chatter of an Australian forest to the comedies of Shakespeare and Molière. Archæologists such as Lubbock, Stevens, and Westropp have been sketching human culture through its pre-historic ages of stone, of bronze, and of iron, from the flint-chip to the steam-engine, from the rude cairn to the marbles of the Parthenon, and exhibiting the savage peoples of the earth in advancing stages, the hunter, the herdsman, the farmer, during long epochs, ere civilization was known. And archæo-geologists, so-called, such as Schmerling, Lartet, and Lyell, have been restoring the flora and fauna of the pre-historic periods, the beech and the horse of the iron age, the oak and the goat of the bronze age, the pine and the reindeer of the stone age, the bear and the glacier of the savage epoch, until at last they have carried the torch into a primeval cavern, among mammoth bones and simian skulls, as the rude birth-place of civilized man.

And the concluding question as to the destiny of mankind, the aim and prospect of the whole human evolution, at length opens two opposite views; on the one side, the prediction of a regenerated race upon the scene of a renovated earth, with the wilderness budding as a rose, the lion transformed into a lamb, and man again an innocent child of paradise; and on the other side, the prognosis of a gradual decline as well as

growth of humanity, when the noblest races shall have lost their ancestral vigor, the richest tongues their classic grace, the finest arts their pristine purity; when even the productive stores and sustaining powers of nature herself shall have been exhausted, and the lingering plants, animals, and effete tribes of men shall fade away like the leaves of autumn, while the earth veers back into her glacial epoch, and the sun can no longer vivify the nations that have basked in his rays.

Problems in the Psychical Sciences.

Our survey has now brought us to the verge of those higher psychical sciences which, as they include the nearest human interests, are bristling with portentous questions, not likely to be treated in that passionless mood which belongs to scientific inquiries, and yet all the more imperiously claiming our attention.

Psychology, at the head of these sciences, is already pressing upon us such problems as the origin, the development and the destiny of the individual, of his cognitions, his emotions, his volitions, and is presenting like divergent opinions; on the one side, such new hypotheses as those of Herbert Spencer Maudsley, and Moleschott, that mind is a product of matter; that the will is a developed force acting under laws; and that death is the dissolution of that matter, the conversion of that force; and on the other side, such traditional dogmas as those of Lactantius, Augustine, and Jerome, that the soul has been created in the body, that the will may be regenerated by irresistible grace, and that the spirit will be reclothed hereafter with the whole present body.

Sociology is not far behind with such problems as the origin, the development, and the destiny of society; of its arts, its sciences, its politics; and is branching with a similar divergence of views; on the one side, the hypotheses of such civilians as Locke, Vico, and Draper, that the State is a social contract; that the history of nations proceeds under periodic and progressive laws, and that societies, like individuals, physiologically viewed, have their infancy, youth, age and decline; are born but to grow and die; and on the other side, the dogmas of such ecclesiastics as Bellarmin, Bossuet and Ed-

wards, that the Church is an absolute theocracy; that Providence throughout history has been a systematic judgment of the nations on behalf of the Church; and that the nations are yet to be subdued by the miraculous return and reign of Christ.

Theology also is emerging with new problems, such as the origin, the development, and the destiny of religion, of its traditions, its creeds, and its cults, and is already breaking into hostile camps; on the one side, the votaries of mere natural religion, such as Theodore Parker, Max Müller, and Comte, holding that there is one essential, universal faith derived from the light of nature; that there has been a scale and growth of religions in history through degrees of relative perfection; and that the perfect religion of the future will consist in the deification of humanity, the worship of womanhood, and the hierarchy of science: and on the other side, the disciples of revealed religion, such as Leland, Paley, and Chalmers, maintaining that a revelation of religion is necessary as well as important; that there has been a primitive miraculous revelation, of which other pretended revelations are but corruptions or counterfeits, and that this revealed religion is destined to prevail over all other religions by supernatural conversions and judgments at the end of the present dispensation.

And the general question to be gathered from all the psychical sciences at length presents to us on the one side the opinion that the regenerate soul, the Church, and the coming millennium are parts of a new spiritual system ensuing upon the old material creation, and on the other side, the conjecture that religion, science, politics, art, all were once potential in the flames of the sun, and must yet revert to the fiery cloud from whence they sprang.

Problems in the Metaphysical Sciences.

Behind these problems of the physical and psychical sciences are others still more recondite and abstruse, the metaphysical questions as to the essential nature of mind and matter, and the absolute reality before and beneath all phenomena; questions which on the one side have at length issued

in the opinions of Herbart, Lotze, and Fechner that phenomena, both material and spiritual, are the expressions of real essences or conscious monads, or self-manifesting souls; together with the extreme speculations of Hegel, Schopenhauer and Hartmann, that the intelligible universe is a logical process of absolute reason and thought, or a product of blind primordial force and human will, or a historical development of unconscious force and will into conscious thought and reason: questions which, on the other side, have scarcely advanced beyond the ancient dogmas, that body and soul are but distinct substances co-acting as instruments of divine purposes, and that there is a trinity of Father, Son, and Spirit in the self-existent Jehovah manifested to us through the miracles of creation, incarnation, atonement, and final judgment. At the same time, as the issue of modern metaphysical thought, we have at the one extreme an optimism which seeks to identify the revealed Jehovah as the one Absolute Reason, the first and final cause of a perfected creation; and at the other extreme, a pessimism which would exhibit the developing universe as an abortive paradox, beginning and ending in hopless contradiction.

And high above all these problems in the different sciences we may now behold the great summary question as to the course and goal of the sciences themselves, as to their logical processes, their historical laws, and their ultimate limits. On the one side we have the decisions of Bacon, D'Alembert, Comte, Mill, and Spencer, that positive science is restricted to facts and their laws without inquiring into their first and final causes; that the more advanced sciences have historically reached this positive state only by excluding all inquiry into causes, and thus outgrowing and destroying theology and metaphysics; and that their final goal is sheer nescience or the recognition of an unknowable reality as the ground of all knowable phenomena. On the other side we have the opinions of Tertullian, Aquinas, Calvin and Butler, that the unknowable to man is revealable by God through miraculously attested communications; that it has been the function of such revelation to remedy human ignorance and expose false science, and that ultimately all earthly science for the

individual will be lost in beatific vision, and for the race will be eclipsed by the millennial light of a new apocalypse.

Such then is the present state of the sciences. While they embrace immense bodies of exact knowledge, too vast for any one mind to master, too magnificent for even the imagination to depict, they also present a bewildering mass of unsolved problems with opposite hypotheses and dogmas respecting them which have been held by the master-spirits of former times and which still engross the leading intellects of our day. Renewing the remark with which this chapter began, that the aim has been simply to state these questions with all fairness and not to discuss them, we shall now submit some deductions from the survey, which seem almost to lie upon the surface in full view of all parties.

In the first place, it is plain that these questions are not purely scientific. They have not been so treated in past ages, and they are not so treated at the present day. No competent scientific authority has yet pronounced upon them. The British Association has not decided them. The French Academy has not decided them. The different Italian, German, and American associations have not decided them. There is not even any spontaneous concurrence of scientific men respecting them, such as that which attends all observed facts, ascertained laws and approved theories. It cannot be claimed that the great names in science have ever been, or are now, arrayed against the religious view of them. And it is not too much to say that they can never be decided by any merely scientific process. The origin and destiny of nebulæ, suns and planets, of man with his individual, social and religious interests, of the universe through all its eras and phases, are surely problems which, by no inductive search among existing facts and laws, can be fully brought within the revision and prevision of science, but must sooner or later, as her most loyal votaries are now confessing, lead her to that verge of the knowable where her torch becomes quenched in the unknowable and she has no more light to shed.

In the second place, it is also clear that these questions are

not merely religious. If they were so treated in former times, they are not so treated to-day. The religious authorities which have ventured to pronounce upon them have not settled them. The Papal Syllabus has not settled them. The Evangelical Alliance has not settled them. The different ecclesiastical councils have not settled them. There is not even such general agreement of religious people concerning them as that which belongs to the chief essentials of the Christian faith. It cannot be held that the great names in religion have always been or are now joined together against the scientific view of them. And it is safe to say that by no purely religious method can they be ever settled. The attempt of all churches and sects combined, through any mere grammatic interpretation of the Holy Scriptures, under pretense of infallible guidance, and in contempt of all other means of knowledge, to show how the heavens and earth and man were created and will be renewed, would simply remand religion to the superstition and bigotry of the dark ages, and at length, as her most devout disciples will admit, dim her light at the very points where it should shine most brightly.

In the third place, it will follow that these questions, being partly scientific and partly religious, are strictly philosophical, and should be so treated by all parties. That they are partly scientific and partly religious is a fact that runs through all the past. From their very origin they have involved both elements. The history of neither could be written without that of the other. The successive conflicts and alliances of the scientific and religious classes at the great epochs of civilization, among the Sophists, among the Fathers, among the Schoolmen, among the Reformers have been the very rhythm of human progress. There is scarcely a dogma which has not served as an hypothesis in science, as there is scarcely an hypothesis which has not been used for a dogma in religion. The great names in each, or at least the masters in both, have ever striven to keep them together rather than to drive them apart. Plato and Origen, Augustine and Erigena, Albertus and Roger Bacon, Francis Bacon and Butler, from age to age, have illustrated their essential oneness. It could be shown, indeed, that the largest minds on both sides have long per-

ceived, that their own peculiar processes and exigencies soon bring them face to face in the mutual recognition of knowable facts which the one must discover and of unknowable realities which the other must reveal. And the common ground between them, formed by their intersecting spheres, instead of narrowing has been enlarging with the lapse of time and the growth of knowledge, until now it has become not merely a conspicuous arena in the philosophical world, but even a field of popular discussion.

Of this fact there could scarcely have been a more striking proof than the recent brilliant and lucid address of Professor Tyndall from the chair of the British Association—an address widely and justly praised, as well for the graces of its style as for the vigor, acuteness, and breadth of its thought, the elevation, courage, and candor of its tone. That the questions which it broaches could be so discussed and received in a scientific body, would be a full vindication, were any needed, of their fitness to such occasions. It is right that the most cultured intelligence of the age should be concentrated upon them, if only they are held under the dry light of pure science within the purview of philosophy. How to adjust them has indeed become "the problem of problems at the present hour;" and that, not merely that we may "yield reasonable satisfaction to a religious sentiment in the emotional nature" (for with this science may have little to do), but also, and chiefly, that we may meet a logical demand of the understanding, a crowning want of the intellect of man.

Perhaps the true philosophical nature of the problems which have been stated could not be better illustrated, for the present purpose at least, than by means of the rhetorical device so skillfully employed in that paper. A disciple of Lucretius, it will be remembered, is supposed to have engaged Bishop Butler in an encounter of wits over one of the chapters of his immortal Analogy; the combatants having been armed with the added knowledge of our time, like Milton's embattled angels, to dare an argument of mysteries. It is easy to paint portraits to suit ourselves while we hold the pencil, and there is always some risk of unfairness when speaking for another. But we may avoid such dangers by simply fancying the two

disputants to reappear at the point which their discussion had reached, and allowing them to proceed with it a step further toward its logical issue. Let the Bishop speak first, and the disciple of Lucretius shall have the last word.

"Before we leave this subject of living agents, most noble Lucretian, I beg to remind you that there is involved in it a very interesting question which you have scarcely touched upon. You will remember that my whole argument had reference not so much to the nature of the living agent or self, as to its destiny. I was trying to prove inductively, from observed facts, that our survival after death is as probable, if not as certain, as any other scientific prevision attempted under like conditions. Beginning with those two great presumptions or high probabilities upon which all positive science proceeds, the uniformity and continuance of nature, I argued that we shall continue to live hereafter, unless it be imagined that death, of which we know nothing, destroys us; and against this mere imaginary presumption I brought forward various scientific presumptions afforded by observation and experience, such as the following: That if death means, as you affirm, the dissolution of your atoms, then your essential bulk may be such that you cannot be dissolved, like that infinitesimal germ out of which has been developed your whole present self, together with the inherited traits of your ancestors: That already most of your atoms have been dissolved and replaced every seven, ten or twenty years, not merely bones, tissues, nerves, but the brain itself, dying a thousand deaths: That large portions even of your nervous atoms might be dissolved without being replaced and you still be conscious of your phantom limb, or go on thinking with but half of your brain: That through all these dissolutions, that hidden self of yours, picture it as you will, persists and survives, with its peculiar powers of thought and feeling, whatever they may be, even amid disease, injury and madness itself: That after the last more rapid dissolution, sooner or later, should you recover that mysterious consciousness of which you have spoken as coming and going so strangely, in some new etherial organism as unlike its old counterpart as that god-like form was itself unlike its earlier

icthyic germ, or as the brilliant insect is unlike its cast-off larva; some spiritual body, wholly imperceptible by our present senses, yet itself gifted with more than microscopic insight, locomotive swiftness or telegraphic thought; all these marvels would be no greater than are daily passing before your eyes: That though existing plants and animals, having shown no such power of individual progression, should perish with their species and be replaced by other and fitter forms in that second state into which you had been born—

> 'With all the circle of the wise,
> The perfect flower of human time,'

yet even this would be only such meet survival as now separates us from primeval ferns and dragons, a just predominance of the higher over the lower forces in the planetary life, a strictly cosmic birth, as free from miracle or catastrophe as the coming of an infant into the world or the transformation of the earth in Spring; in a word, 'as natural as the visible known course of things.'

"You will observe that this argument, in its nature, is a mere scientific hypothesis, and not a religious dogma. I have carefully excluded from it any theological, metaphysical or even ethical opinions which might seem to prejudice it in your eyes. You may have your own opinions upon such points, and the argument will still hold. You may picture yourself as the merest combination of atoms that the materialist can conceive; but I have shown you that the dissolution of our 'gross organized bodies would not be our destruction; even without determining whether our living substances be material or immaterial.' You may imagine that combination of your atoms to have been as fortuitous as any the atheist can trace; but 'that we are to live hereafter is just as reconcilable with the scheme of atheism, and as well to be accounted for by it, as that we are now alive is; and therefore nothing can be more absurd than to argue from that scheme that there can be no future state.' You may even discard the moral motives of such a state for any humane virtues that the secularist may practice, as 'if it were certain that our future interest no way depended upon our present behaviour;' yet, 'curiosity could not but sometimes bring a subject in which

we may be so highly interested to our thoughts, especially upon the mortality of others or the near prospect of our own;' and it is in the light of such mere curiosity, as a question of pure science, that I have put it before you, to be tested as coolly as you would dissect an embryo or a chrysalis."

Lucretius, if history speaks truly, was not the man to shirk a question because of its logical consequences, and we can fancy without much effort what sort of rejoinder a true Lucretian would make to the Bishop's reasoning.

"I have listened," he might say, "to your ingenious argument with the interest of a philosopher. It bears upon a subject which engrossed some of the finest minds of Greece and Rome, from Socrates and Plato to Cicero and Seneca. It was not, you are aware, the doctrine of Epicurus, nor that which I learned from my master. He taught me that from atoms all things have come, and to atoms they must return. Through their endless compositions and decompositions the forms of beast, bird, and flower appear and disappear, come and go, and are seen no more. Even the etherial and luminous particles of the soul itself, together with the grosser body through which they are diffused, must scatter and vanish like down before the wind. Death is therefore the mere dissolution of our own peculiar atoms, and there can be nothing to survive the disintegration of the body.

"And this theory he framed for the purpose of counteracting certain dogmas which dominated in his time. He saw men everywhere terrified with omens and disasters, which they attributed to the anger of the gods, and in order to dispel their fears, depicted those ideal beings in a remote heaven of apathy, sublimely indifferent to mortals, while nature moved on beneath, with her measureless surges of atoms, majestically as the roll of his own hexameter. He found his countrymen wasting their best days in alternate dread and hope of Tartarean torments and Elysian raptures, and admonished them that the truest and highest virtue would scorn such selfish motives, and only look for the reward of duty in a tranquil enjoyment of the present life. And that other remaining terror of death, which was ever shading their path, he stripped before them into an empty negation as

the mere loss of life, the last atomic thrill with which to glide into the passionless calm of the gods. He lived about sixty years before the Christian era. As I have explained to you, he died in the faith in which he had lived, and by his own tragic fate illustrated his creed as he stood, in the prime of life, at the height of his fame, about to execute that purpose from which the more irresolute Hamlet quailed:

> 'And therefore now
> Let her, that is the womb and tomb of all,
> Great Nature, take, and forcing far apart,
> Those blind beginnings that have made me man,
> Dash them anew together at her will
> Through all her cycles.'

Now I do not say, I have not said, that I adopt these theological and ethical opinions of my master, though they were essential parts of his system; but if I should lay them aside, as you have laid aside yours, there would then remain this mere hypothesis before us to be tested like any other by the facts. And it strikes me simply as a strong physical analogy which still lacks confirmation. Let me show you how far I might go with you. You have proved that death may be but the birth into another life, that there is nothing improbable in a future state into which we may pass, 'just as naturally as we came into the present.' Seneca surmised as much when he likened those who look for a future life to children in the womb preparing for this world. You have also projected into the future newer and higher organic types beyond those which, from the mollusk up to man, have been unfolded in the past. Such attempted prevision cannot seem wholly unscientific to a Lucretian, who believes it would have been possible 'from a knowledge of the properties of the cosmic vapor to have predicted the state of the fauna of Britain in the year 1869 with as much certainty as one can say what will happen to the vapor of the breath on a cold winter's day.' Nor have we any right 'to assume that man's present faculties end the series,' which has extended all the way 'from the Iguanodon and his cotemporaries to the Presidents and members of the British Association.' But at this point the difficulties begin. You have not supplied all the

intermediate links in your ideal scale between our future and our present organized selves. You have not shown the one evolving out of the other, the higher out of the lower. You have not exhibited that coming psychical body as originating among the spaceless atoms or punctual forces or plastic processes of the present organism, nor exposed to view the germination of its peculiar faculties and powers. You have not proved the capacity of existing earth and man to produce such spiritual bodies. You have not determined whether the interval between them and us will be brief or long; whether they will recover consciousness soon or late; whether they will be developed slowly or in a moment. In a word, the evidences of such a metamorphosis cannot be gathered from the existing state of knowledge, and if immediately forthcoming would appear little short of miraculous. Upon one point, however, we are agreed. You concede to science those rights of unrestricted search and free discussion which have been so hardly won in 'the progress of learning and of liberty.' That is all I ask. And I beg to assure you that in the event of any other trustworthy proofs of a future state being produced, it would be no bar to the theory even in the view of a Lucretian, that it should be found coincident with the Jewish and Christian prejudices of an honored prelate whom no one admires more than I do. On the contrary, to receive and act upon it, at least as a working hypothesis, would be but the dictate of Greek wisdom as well as Roman virtue."

Leaving these somewhat prejudiced opponents, let us now turn to another historic personage, accepted by them and by us all, with the concurrent voice of more than two centuries of trial, as an umpire,

> "Whom a wise king and nature chose
> Lord Chancellor of both their laws."

Francis Bacon was neither a mere scientist nor a mere divine, but a civilian and a philosopher who embraced within the view of his judicial intellect the most advanced science and the best divinity of his time. He projected and partly constructed a magnificent "Instauration of the Sciences," which

was designed to include all existing knowledge, both divine and human, in one comprehensive system. May we find any decisions of this high authority that will bear upon the controversy?

At one moment, indeed, he seems to lean toward the side of Lucretius. Having spoken of a sensitive or produced soul, which he describes as derived from the elements, and common to man and the brute, he urges more diligent inquiry into its faculties of voluntary motion and sensibility, and as to its nature, distinctly allows it must be material, "a corporeal substance, attenuated by heat and rendered invisible, as a subtile breath or aura, of a flamy and airy nature, diffused through the whole body, but in perfect creatures residing chiefly in the head and thence running through the nerves, being fed and recruited by the spirituous blood of the arteries, as Telesius and his follower Donius have usefully shown."

At another moment his judgment is on the side of Butler. Superadding to the sensitive or produced soul that rational or inspired soul which proceeds from the breath of God, and distinguishes man from the brutes, he concludes that "inquiries with relation to its nature, as whether it be native or adventitious, separable or inseparable, mortal or immortal, how far subject to laws of matter, how far not, and the like—though they might be more thoroughly sifted in philosophy than hitherto they have been—in the end must be turned over to religion for determination and decision; since no knowledge of the substance of the rational soul can be had from philosophy, but must be derived from the same divine inspiration, whence the substance thereof originally proceeded."

At the same time, he is careful to vindicate such a method of turning the scale by Scriptural authority as still consistent and just to both parties: "We would not have borrowed this division from divinity, had it not also agreed with philosophy. For there are many excellencies of the human soul above the souls of brutes, manifest even to those who philosophize only according to sense. And wherever so many and such great excellencies are found, a specific difference should always be made. We do not, therefore, approve that confused and pro-

miscuous manner of the philosophers in treating the functions of the soul, as if the soul of man differed in degree rather than species from the soul of brutes, as the sun differs from the stars, or gold from other metals."

And this is but an example of the general manner in which the great acknowledged master of philosophy would treat that whole class of scientific and religious problems which we have described as connected with the origin, course and destiny of nature.

Now, he yields to science all it can claim, as he argues so eloquently that the inquiry for final causes is wrongly placed in physics, and hath made a great devastation in that province: "And, therefore, the natural philosophies of Democritus and others, who allow no God or mind in the frame of things, but attribute the structure of the universe to infinite essays and trials of nature, or what they call fate or fortune, and assign the causes of particular things to the necessity of matter without any intermixture of final causes, seem, so far as we can judge from the remains of their philosophy much more solid, and to have gone deeper into nature with regard to physical causes, than the philosophy of Aristotle or Plato; and this only because they never meddled with final causes, which the others were perpetually inculcating."

Again, he reserves for religion all that it demands, while he shows that final causes, when kept where they belong within the bounds of theology and metaphysics, are not repugnant to physical causes, but agree excellently with them as expressing the intentions of Providence in the consequences of nature: "But Democritus and Epicurus when they advanced their atoms were thus far tolerated by some, but when they asserted the fabric of all things to be raised by a fortuitous concourse of these atoms, without the help of mind, they became universally ridiculous. So far are physical causes from drawing men off from God and Providence, that, on the contrary, the philosophers employed in discovering them can find no rest but by flying to God and Providence at last."

And when we inquire how these two adjacent provinces are to be preserved and adjusted, we may hear him discoursing of a Primary Philosophy, or mother of all the sciences,

by whom they are to be cherished, and around whom their wrangling sisterhood is to be gathered in harmony. His conception of such a philosophy may seem crude and vague, but not more so than might have been expected in that age. In fact he is inclined to note it as still wanting; and in terms that almost exactly describe the exigency upon us at this hour: "For I find a certain rhapsody of natural theology, logic and physics, delivered in a certain sublimity of discourse, by such as aim at being admired for standing on the pinnacles of the sciences; but what we mean is, without ambition, to design some general science, for the reception of axioms, not peculiar to any one science, but common to a number of them."

The three personages before us have thus illustrated the classes to which they respectively belong, and the interests which they represent. Philosophy, in the best sense of the word, is the umpire between science and religion. As originally defined by Pythagoras and Cicero, it is itself the science of things divine and human, together with their causes. As that academic faculty which is complementary to the others, it includes whatsoever is common to both the secular and sacred departments of learning. As the science of knowledge, it aims to ascertain inductively the validity, the limits and the functions of reason and revelation, the two great correlate factors of knowledge. As the science of the absolute, so called by the Germans, it takes within its scope both the finite and the infinite, both the knowable and the unknowable, for the respective provinces of reason and revelation. As that summary universal science of which Bacon speaks, to which all the rest are tributary, it receives and cherishes impartially and equally the discovered and the revealed bodies of knowledge, that it may organize them into a rational system. And finally, in the most common and literal sense of the word, as the love of wisdom, Philosophy, while including and fostering the scientific and religious qualities of curiosity and reverence, over and above these retains others more peculiar to herself, such as that power of abstraction, that insight into reality, that catholicity of view, that unquenchable craving for unity of truth and symmetry of knowledge, which are not so likely

to be practiced by the mere scientist, or mere religionist, so long as he is immersed in his own special researches, and which yet easily come to them both, the moment they step into her wider sphere.

It is to be regretted that a prejudice should exist in some minds against a word of such noble significance, and all the more as it is only in rare cases that its true meaning would be repudiated. Though a few scientists and religionists may now and then have denounced philosophy as speculative or rationalistic, yet the great mass would simply resent the imputation of being unphilosophical, as an insult to their understandings. There is plainly a good and valuable sense of the term which both parties spontaneously unite in using, and which ought not to be sacrificed in any mere logomachy, so long as we have no better word to express it. If we would characterize a lover, seeker and reconciler of all truths, both natural and revealed, we must term him a philosopher. If we would describe that special work which is to be done in adjusting the relations of religion and science, in ascertaining and defending their respective spheres and prerogatives, in devising and applying logical rules to their pending controversies, in sifting their several portions of truth from error, and combining them into a harmonious system—we can only speak of all this as a peculiar intellectual task belonging neither to religion alone, nor to science alone, but to their common ally and friend, philosophy.

Religion alone could not furnish the needed umpire. Concede to the utmost her high prerogatives: grant that she stands upon the authority of a divine revelation and that for its interpretation she has an equally divine illumination in the whole Church and in each believer; yet that revelation, by its own self-prescribed limits, is found to exclude her from the legitimate fields of science, and that illumination renders neither her public nor private judgment infallible in scientific researches. Has she revealed to us the laws of matter, motion, force, heat, light, electricity, or life? Will she make sages of her saints and inspire her priests with science? Can she, by any mere sacred penetration, outstrip the slow process of induction and unfold the endless secrets of nature? As soon

as she flies against facts, in her maintenance of doctrines, does she not suffer for the trespass? And has not her whole history shown that, when exclusively pursued, her very virtues through excess have bred moral habits unfavorable to physical investigations? that her reverence has degenerated into superstition, her faith wandered into mysticism, and her zeal flamed into intolerance, until she has been ready to spurn away all science as alien or heathen? And while in such mood will she even deign to appear at the bar of reason? It is but too obvious that, as to any scientific questions or any religious questions involving scientific facts, the mere religionist would be no fit arbiter.

Science alone could not furnish the needed umpire. Concede all that she can justly claim; grant that she proceeds upon a basis of facts and that her process is unerring in attaining actual knowledge; yet that knowledge, bounded as it is by the limits of reason, until supplemented by revelation, can never extend to the transcendental realms of religion. What can she tell of the nature, character and policy of the Creator, of the origin and object of the creation, of the duty and destiny of the creature? By what rash generalizations from facts to principles, "like Pelion upon Ossa piled," can she climb into that empyrean of divinity? The moment she trenches upon revealed doctrines, does she not betray her weakness and bewilderment? And has not her whole history shown that, when exclusively pursued, she has only engendered mental habits which are unfavorable to spiritual inquiries? that her reliance upon the senses has tended to materialism, her caution run into scepticism, and her pride of knowledge begotten irreverence, until she has scoffed at all religion as mere superstition or delusion? And while in such temper, will she even be admitted within the purlieu of revelation? It is manifest that, as to any religious questions or any scientific questions involving religious truths, the mere scientist would be no fit arbiter.

Philosophy, at least, is the actual, the accepted umpire. The two parties have ever in fact, even though without concert, practically owned her jurisdiction, and sought to justify themselves to each other in her view. It has been their aim

to show that in being scientific or religious they mean to be also philosophical, to sacrifice no essential portion of the whole truth, and do no outrage to that common reason without which we can judge neither of the evidence of religion, nor of the claims of science. Instinctively they have appealed to her, in every great crisis of free thought, to guard and vindicate at once the authority of revelation and the rights of reason. And this unconscious tribute has been more than repaid. To her, from the days of Justin, the first apologist, religion largely owes its evidences, its defences, its appliances; to her, since the time of Aristotle, the first great logician, science is mainly indebted for its methods, its rights, its triumphs; and at this moment, in spite of their conflicting partisans, under her mild umpirage, whatsoever the one can establish as truly revealed, and the other as actually discovered, will be spontaneously accepted by them both.

Philosophy, too, is the only available umpire. If we wished it otherwise we would wish in vain. The moment the two parties come into collision, it is found that neither can impose its own terms upon the other. Paramount as religion must be in her own sphere with her inspired Bible and her illumined Church, yet scientific men will not accept from mere religionists a judgment upon their theories; and paramount as science must be in her own sphere, with her unerring methods and unquestionable facts, yet religious men will not accept from mere scientists a judgment upon their doctrines. Neither party will be acknowledged as a competent and disinterested judge of the questions in dispute. Neither can afford from its own one-sided position a calm and full survey of the whole field of controversy. The rival claimants must leave their different spheres, though without sacrificing them, and, for the time at least, appear in some middle outside province which shall be equally removed from their respective prejudices and temptations, where the whole truth shall be sought and prized as truth alone; and for such a province we have no better name than philosophy. If at that only possible tribunal, either could prevail against the other, so far as we can see (without some miraculous interposition for which we have no right to look), religion would degener-

ate into superstition and science into imbecility; but being there legitimated and reconciled, they will join hands as twin daughters of God and lovers of man.

Philosophy, moreover, is the one desirable umpire. It is best that the two parties should agree to treat the mixed problems rising between them as properly philosophical, rather than merely scientific or purely religious. Their attempts to settle them apart, each by its own method, have brought upon us overwhelming evils. If the time once was when the religious class was unfolding a whole cyclopedia of science out of the Scriptures, from Genesis to the Apocalypse, as pure dogma and mystery of faith, yet the time has now come when a few, at least, in the scientific class are exhibiting a new genesis and apocalypse of religion as the sheer product of science and speculation. And it is high time—we may venture to say in the name of the great body of sober and fair minds on both sides, who refuse to commit themselves to such wild extremes—that the two antagonists, on thus emerging from their respective provinces into the broad plain of philosophy, should learn to respect their common rights and interests, and not imagine that either can claim the whole field against the other. It is time the religionist should recognize that immense mass of facts, theories, hypotheses, which is the fruit of two thousand years of research, which stands upon foundations of proof that cannot be shaken and is rising into a superstructure of knowledge too vast even to be conceived. It is time, too, that the scientist should cease to ignore that vast body of truths, doctrines, dogmas, backed by evidences which have been accumulating for eighteen centuries under the most searching criticism, which have more than convinced the great master minds of the past, and which are mounting every hour with cumulative probability toward moral certainty itself. And when at length both parties meet face to face, as they are now meeting before the final problem of the universe, it is time for the one to admit that the processes of creation have not been revealed, and cannot, by the most exact criticism, the most profound exegesis, the most systematic divinity, ever be discerned in the mere letter of Holy Scripture; and for the other to perceive that the theory

of a Creator, anthropomorphic as it may appear, still keeps the field, still satisfies an immense number of scientific minds, and is not likely to be abandoned even by the most advanced scientists, until something else or something better has been offered in its place. Only when they have thus taken philosophical views of the whole range of knowledge will they cease their raids upon each other's territory, and no longer maintain hostile barriers or hollow truces within the domain of truth. In the realm of philosophy alone can they meet and find their needed mutual support, completion and harmony.

Philosophy is, in fact, herself impelled by her own high instinct to seek their reconciliation. It is that last crowning problem which remains for her to solve. A scientist, as we have seen, may hold his scientific hypotheses in antagonism or indifference to religious truth and still be a good scientist; or a religionist may hold his religious dogmas in opposition or indifference to scientific facts and still be a sound divine; but the moment either would intelligently combine religious truths with scientific facts, he becomes something more and higher than any mere specialist, content with his own fragmentary knowledge and opinions; something more than any mere scholar, who amasses crude learning; something more even than a logician, who reasons conclusively; he is also and pre-eminently a seeker of truth, a lover of wisdom, a philosopher; and in so far as he can truly claim that title he will not rest satisfied until he has found all truth and wisdom, embraced both religion and science within his view, and rendered them consistent and harmonious.

The reconciliation of Science and Religion is not only a distinctive problem of Philosophy, but precisely that one chief problem by the solution of which her own function is exhausted, her goal attained, her mission accomplished. In establishing the validity of human reason, in maintaining the authority of divine revelation, in logically combining them as coördinate means of knowledge and pouring their blended light upon all classes of facts, she is but fulfilling that sublime ideal towards which her followers from age to age have been struggling with unquenchable hope and courage. The one

last perfect Philosophy is to be sought and can only be found in the demonstrated harmony of Science and Religion.

It should be carefully observed, at this point, that no disparagement of any one of the three interests, certainly no exaltation of science over religion, or of philosophy over either, is implied in this definition of their related provinces. An umpire is but the servant of the game that he watches, making neither the laws nor the facts, but simply applying the one to the other. And that only true philosophy which seeks to embrace both science and religion in their normal relations must itself be predetermined and limited by them. Any attempt of the philosophic spirit to intrude into their domains with the view of distorting scientific facts or religious truths for mere speculative purposes, can only issue in confusion and evil. The so-called philosophies of Nature, such as those of Schelling and Oken, which aim to construct hypothetically the material universe without full empirical research, as well as the miscalled philosophies of religion, such as those of Hegel and Comte, which seek to prejudge the powers and relations of the Absolute Intelligence without regard to its actual expressions, are alike vain attempts of the mere reason to dispense with experience and revelation. And the would-be philosophers who aspire to conciliate the scientific and the religious spirit without any practical acquaintance with either, are only sure to fall under the contempt of both.

As little would it follow from the proposed definition, that the philosophical spirit must needs be organized in some visible tribunal, issuing authoritative decisions. The scientific spirit does not thus reach its results through any of the mere institutions or associations which embody and express it; and the religious spirit, though incorporated in churches and councils and claiming the authority of an infallible Scripture, does not command universal agreement. It is the crowning misfortune of the present crisis, that neither the disciples of religion nor the votaries of science are united in their respective interpretations of the Bible and of Nature, but appear divided among themselves, as well as opposed to each other, by endless hypotheses and dogmas, throughout the entire field of research. And yet, as there must still be such a thing

as true science and true religion amid all the schools and the sects, so there may be a true philosophy ever discriminating and mediating between them and a hidden fraternity of philosophers more or less consciously striving to bring them into harmony.

It seems scarcely necessary to add that there can be no invidious distinction of classes in the pure democracy of intellect. The philosophic class is but recruited from the scientific and religious ranks, and can neither exist nor flourish without them. Any one joins it who pleases, stays in it as long as he chooses, and falls or rises by his own merit. None need to enter it who feel, as at times we all feel, that life is full enough of problems without adding to their number. Some may prefer to seclude themselves within their own provinces, to which they are wedded with the zeal of a votary. Others may make chance excursions beyond them, only to retire as quickly to less debatable ground. Still others may even accept conscious contradiction rather than open conflict, resolutely holding the sternest creed with the strictest science, like the great Faraday, of whose laboratory and oratory it has been said, that he never entered either without shutting the door of the other. But the days for such a state of parties seem to be passing away. The trumpet of a new campaign has been sounded. Combatants have been marshaled, and the lines are forming. When scientific and religious bodies have already begun to discuss the same problems from their opposite points of view, there can only be warfare or agreement. And in such a crisis, it is easy to see that the honors are more likely to go to those who are championing the extreme wings of philosophy than to any that may be so brave or so rash as to risk the cross-fire between them.

In concluding this argument, it may be well to notice some of the objections which might be brought against it, and which have actually been suggested in various quarters, since it was first presented in a memoir read before the Philosophical Society of Washington.

There is a practical, though not very pertinent objection derived from the relative importance of the truths of religion

and of science. It has been well said by Butler, in reply to such invidious distinctions, that we are not competent judges of what knowledge is best for us, and that in fact scientific knowledge is of the greatest consequence to man; and it was one of the latest sayings of Agassiz, that all science is sacred and nature itself a sort of holy scripture. But if it be granted that religious doctrines, as commonly understood, are infinitely more momentous than existing scientific verities, when viewed in a practical light, yet this is not precisely the aspect under which they appear to the philosopher. It is but a truism to say that all truths are equally true, whether scientific or religious, and to raise the question of their comparative value is irrelevant and unseasonable, when the chief business is the search for truth itself as truth and for its own sake, though, if once in the grasp, it will indeed prove no worthless guerdon, but the sovereign good of human nature.

There is also a covert fallacy upon which many proceed in denying the fact or need of any such umpirage, any such conciliatory office between existing science and religion, as has been described under the name of philosophy. Apparently, they would leave their respective partizans to fight their way into defeat or victory, like two belligerent powers between whom neither peace nor truce is possible. To borrow an inadequate illustration from the political sphere, it is as if it should be thought better for England and the United States to have rushed into an unnatural war than to have submitted their relative claims to an international tribunal; or wiser for two great parties to have become embroiled in terrible anarchy than to have consented to the recent Electoral Commission. Even if the reconciliation of religion and science be viewed as a question of degrees, that philosophy which would adjust them partially and problematically would be nobler and safer than a mere aimless strife and confusion between them, and all such scruples must vanish, if it be shown that the true, ultimate philosophy, as the great debate proceeds, will involve a growing vindication of truth against error by means of divine revelation as well as human reason.

Of more strictly logical objections deserving attention, the first is that the philosopher is supposed to approach the sub-

ject with foregone conclusions in respect to some of the most important questions involved in the debate. This may be so. Why should it be otherwise? Before the debate can proceed intelligently, there are certain preliminary questions which must and ought to be settled, and which can only be settled, as we have maintained, by philosophical minds. If, for example, the evidences of the Christian revelation should be found insufficient, it would be unphilosophical for a theologian to appeal to that revelation as a source of knowledge in debating with a scientist; but if they are found sufficient, it would be unphilosophical for a scientist to reject or ignore that revelation in debating with a theologian. And until this primary question has been decided, any further debate in respect to other questions would not only be unphilosophical in both parties, but also useless. The whole field of natural theology and the Christian evidences logically precedes all questions between the Bible and Science. Surely something ought to be considered settled as the great debate proceeds, or we shall only be ever returning upon our tracks to the point from which we started. Moreover, it should not be forgotten that the only parties that can be supposed to need or accept reconciliation are the scientist and the religionist, not the atheist and the theologian, not the infidel and the Christian, who could never agree and preserve their distinctive characters. Scientists, as such, are not atheists and infidels. On the contrary, the simple fact is that as a class they have never repudiated the authority of a divine revelation, but only some human dogmatic interpretation which has been substituted for revelation, and often thrust forward into their domain as if it were itself the infallible word of God.

A second objection is, that it is assumed that specialists are not capable of drawing inferences from the facts of their respective departments. History too plainly shows that this assumption is safe and wise in reference to the theological, as well as the scientific specialist. Luther, Calvin, and Turrettin inferred from the facts of their department that the sun revolves around the earth, and bitterly denounced the Copernican theory as a heresy. And no wonder. It seemed to them to impugn the very veracity of Scripture, to tear the

earth reeling from its center, and revolutionize with it the whole existing doctrine of heaven and hell. It would probably have been harder for us to accept that hypothesis then, than it would be for us to accept the development hypothesis now. They simply drew their own special inferences from Scriptural facts, as too many are still doing, and the result was a humiliating defeat from which we have not yet fully recovered. And this is but one among other instances showing that the most devout and orthodox divines in dealing with religio-scientific questions are not only liable to err, but likely to err, if they refuse to allow philosophers to compare their dogmatic views of Scripture with the ascertained facts of nature, or what amounts to the same thing, if they decline themselves to take such a philosophical position.

A third objection is, that the special work assigned to the philosopher may be done by either the scientist or the theologian. In a guarded sense, and to a limited extent, this is true. Although the reconciliation of science and religion cannot be accomplished by any one mind, or single generation, yet every true philosopher contributes something to the process, even though, in other spheres and relations, he were also a scientist or a theologian. But it is only when acting as a philosopher that he can properly be said to join in that work. The moment he should appear in the high debate avowing any other character and purpose, as a mere scientist or as a mere theologian, he would be universally challenged for an incompetent witness, or a professional advocate. It is true that the most interested witness, or the most vehement advocate in one case might become a competent judge in another case, and there find himself obliged by the facts and the laws to decide against his own cherished impressions or prejudices. And so an exact physicist or a zealous apologist might exchange his special aim for the more general task of a philosophic seeker after absolute truth in regions of thought and research, where both nature and Scripture would compel him very seriously to modify his favorite hypotheses or dogmas. It is also true that the mass of divines and savants are likely to remain mere specialists, wedded to their chosen pursuits; and yet, in every science, there will always be some

whom the philosophic passion impels to take a more encyclopædiac range, with the dauntless hope of reducing the mass of truth and knowledge to unity and harmony. If this is all that is meant by saying that "the special work assigned to the philosopher may be done by either the scientist or the theologian," it is only a variation of our own statement, that "the philosophic class is but recruited from the scientific and religious ranks, and can neither exist nor flourish without them."

The same objection has been brought in another form. It has been suggested that the work of reconciliation might be divided among our four classes, the Extremists, the Indifferentists, the Eclectics, the Sceptics; and, in particular, that the Eclectics are already doing that work as best they can with the materials in hand. But throughout the whole first part of this treatise, it has been shown that these are the very parties who are unfit for such a philosophical task; the two former classes, as their names imply, being actually averse to it, and the two latter having attempted it unphilosophically and failed. It is true that even the infidel without meaning it, and the sciolist without knowing it, may furnish occasional labor and materials, which the philosopher can use with due modification for his own higher purposes. It is also true, as premised in a former chapter, that among the religious eclectics may be some who have the true cognitive theory latent in their minds and whose work therefore will endure and appear in the final system of knowledge. It may even be said that a sound eclecticism borders on true philosophy. These admissions do not touch the principle in question. It is one thing to attempt to harmonize science and religion as an apologete, solely in the interest of the latter and for the defence of a dogmatic faith; but another thing to attempt this as a philosopher, equally in the interest of both and with the view of establishing and completing a theory or system of knowledge, divine and human. To such a theory or system the four classes by their very definition can have no just relation. The extremist would oppose it; the indifferentist would have nothing to do with it; the eclectic would hinder more than help it; the despondent has already abandoned it. The true philosopher alone, as a lover of wisdom, can make it a supreme object of hope and effort.

A fourth objection has reference mainly to the normal order of the unsolved problems falling within the purview of philosophy. It is imagined that the arbitration could only begin by assuming the Bible to be true and thus beg the gravest question now before the world. The reverse of this has been maintained. It was shown on a former page that the whole field of natural theology and the Christian evidences logically precedes all questions emerging between the Bible and Science, and should be so treated in the philosophic umpirage. The problem of theism, therefore, would come under discussion before any question as to the veracity of scripture. In this opening contest could the scientist, as it were, drive the theologian out of court, the umpirage would end in his favor and no parties would remain to be reconciled. But should there be found any proof of a God or of a revelation, the debate might then begin and proceed through the whole series of consequent problems between science and religion, science and the Bible, science and Christianity. True enough it is that this logical order cannot always be strictly chronological. If we would wait until all logically connected questions can be settled chronologically, one after another, we should have to wait a long time. Life is too short and the task too great for such a treatment. The simple fact is, that the question of a revelation is involved in all the other questions and proceeds with them, ever gaining as well as giving proof. It is at once the beginning and the end of a high argument, which will not be complete until all doubts are resolved and the last cavil has been repelled.

The same reply must be made to the charge that the philosophic judgment might lean toward agnosticism and leave infidelity or bigotry as the only alternatives. This is simply another of the preliminary questions of the umpirage, and one which has been philosophically treated in the next three chapters.

A fifth scruple is, that all the great problems, if thus referred to a final or future philosophy, are left as open questions and may so remain for many a day. They are open questions only in the sense in which all questions are open, which do not admit of demonstrative as distinguished from

probable evidence, the most scientific as well as the religious; and if in any other sense they are kept open, it will not be by the philosophy which seeks to close and settle them, but by the polemic divines and scientists that refuse its mild and just umpirage. Moreover, such philosophy has already gathered proof enough for the most philosophic minds, and is only called final or ultimate because it has its roots in the past as well as its growth through all the future.

A sixth and last objection is found in the fact that no satisfactory results would be reached in practice, if by the umpirage of philosophy is meant the arbitration of fallible men of like passions with our own. But there is a manifest difference between any contemporary philosopher and that great historic personage who has been universally accepted as an authority after more than two centuries of trial. And it should also be observed that we have distinctly precluded all reference to any visible tribunal issuing authoritative decisions. After using the rhetorical device of Professor Tyndall as a mere illustration, we have described the vast social process of reconciling the two great catholic interests of religion and science as peculiarly belonging to philosophy, not to any single philosopher surely, nor yet to any one philosophical school, but simply to that entire philosophic mind or spirit which pervades all schools, and lives and grows through all generations. And already, the immense services of such a philosophic spirit, to religion as well as to science, have become too obvious to be gainsaid. But for that spirit the Church to-day might be denouncing the rotundity of the earth as a deadly heresy, stigmatizing our antipodes as heathen myths or outcasts from grace, and consigning to the flames of the hell beneath, all who doubted the motion of the heavens above. By means of that spirit have been steadily reared those bulwarks of evidence, wall within wall and battlement above battlement, which now surround the citadel of the essential faith. It is that spirit, too, which has prescribed for science its methods and laws, has kept it within its just bounds, and is still at work upon its unsolved problems, with a patient faith that refuses to commit itself to any partisan extremes of the hour. And as the great debate goes on, it is that spirit which ever hopes for

yet higher sacred triumphs in the future than any that have been won in the past.

Let the nature of this great umpirage, with the case to be submitted, be now briefly summarized. Under the head of competency for the umpireship must be included the scientific virtues of curiosity, accuracy, and candor, the religious graces of reverence, humility, and faith, and over and above these the more philosophical qualities of abstraction and generalization, insight into reality, catholicity of view, and unquenchable craving for unity of truth, and for symmetry of knowledge. Among the terms of the umpirage must be premised and vindicated the validity of reason, the evidence of revelation, their correlation in each science and in the scale of the sciences, and the logical rules applicable to their normal, existing and prospective relations. As issues for the umpirage are presented the opposite hypotheses and dogmas held concerning the origin, development, and destiny of the heavens, of the earth and of man, of the individual and of society, of art, science, politics, and religion, together with the great metaphysical controversies and philosophical disputes which have divided the sects and the schools in all ages and countries.

A glimpse is enough to show us the vastness of the theme. Not by any one mind, not by any one people, not by any one age can it be mastered. It is the mighty argument of successive generations, proceeding with stately steps from its premises in a remote past toward its conclusions in a distant future. If we will surrender ourselves to it, we can see whither it is carrying us, and exult in the prospect.

In the view of religion, everything may appear miraculous; in the view of science everything may appear natural; while in the view of philosophy both will only appear more and more consistent aspects of one and the same reality. Let science, if it can, resolve the whole course of nature into one continuous process of correlate forces; let religion, if it must, exhibit that course of nature as one dazzling series of miracles; a true philosophy will yet behold them blending together as but the sure logic and even pulse of one Almighty Mind, ever reasoning through the whole creation, and flushing with life all creatures

As yet, indeed, to us who can see but a speck, a span, of the two vast coinciding spheres, they must seem confused, dark and often contradictory. But "there may be beings in the universe, whose capacities and knowledge and views may be so extensive as that the whole Christian dispensation may to them appear natural; as natural as the visible known course of things appears to us." Be that as it may, if we will read the future as we can the past, it will not seem incredible that the most extreme investigators are now but groping through the darkness toward some central point where, at length, they shall meet as in a focus of light. Only, we may be sure, they will meet there, not like those two rash knights at their first encounter, not like those eager champions who are now filling the air with challenges and criminations, but rather like exhausted and bleeding warriors, after having fought their way into a recognition of each others' truth and virtue, to clasp hands as friends who had but mistaken themselves for foes.

CHAPTER II.

THE POSITIVE PHILOSOPHY OR THEORY OF NESCIENCE.

THE position taken in the last chapter is, that the numerous unsolved problems now in debate between scientists and religionists are neither purely scientific, nor merely religious, but properly philosophical questions, to be discussed in a philosophical spirit, to be kept within the province of philosophical minds, and to be wrought as fast as they are settled into the ultimate philosophical system. We cannot decide them as mere theologians, appealing to Scripture alone; we cannot decide them as mere scientists, appealing to Nature alone; we can only decide them as philosophers, lovers of all knowledge and truth, embracing both Nature and Scripture in our view, sifting the evidence brought by their respective disciples, and then basing our conclusions upon that evidence, even though it should be against our previous opinions and wishes. This was also expressed in a more figurative manner by personifying the opposing interests of Science and Religion and representing Philosophy as the umpire between them; not any individual philosopher between any individual scientist and religionist; nor yet any particular system of philosophy to which both might appeal as a standard; but simply that philosophic mind, genius, or spirit which in the whole race of true philosophers has ever sought, and still seeks, with more or less thoroughness and success, to mediate between conflicting sects and schools, to distinguish their truths from their errors, and to derive from them the final system of perfect knowledge.

Now, it will be found that there are two extreme philosophical tendencies at the present day, susceptible of conciliation and combination, and thus giving rise to three distinct systems of science in relation to religion: 1st. The Positive Philosophy or theory of nescience as ignoring revelation. 2d. The Absolute Philosophy or theory of omniscience as superseding revelation. 3d. The Ultimate Philosophy or theory of perfectible science as concurring with revelation. We are to discuss the two former with the view of maintaining the latter.

The Positive Philosophy, according to its chief founder, Auguste Comte, restricts science to the laws of phenomena without inquiring into their causes, first or final, and therefore excludes theology and the metaphysical sciences, retains only the empirical sciences of mathematics, astronomy, physics, chemistry, physiology, social physics, and proposes a historical law of their evolution in a serial order, each through three stages, the first theological, the second metaphysical, and the third positive. Mr. J. Stuart Mill, in his System of Logic, adopts substantially the system of Comte, whilst enlarging his classification of the sciences so as to embrace psychology and ethics in distinction from the purely physical sciences. Mr. Herbert Spencer, in his New Philosophy, supports the same theory of nescience with the logic of Hamilton and Mansel, but classifies the sciences differently, and denies that they have observed a serial order in their evolution, or that the true historical law of their genesis has yet been found. Mr. George H. Lewes, as a disciple of Comte, characterizes the Unknowable Absolute of Spencer as a monotheistic development of fetichism, and maintains that the true Absolute Existence is the sum total of things, known only in part and by Feeling; but at the same time claims that some of the metaphysical sciences admit of the positive method, and proposes the term metempirical, in place of metaphysical, to distinguish the unknowable from the knowable region of research. Dr. John Fiske, in his "Cosmic Philosophy," as an independent critic of Comte and Spencer, has not only improved their systems, but maintained with remarkable vigor and acuteness, that in place of the three stages in the evolution of science,

there is but one continuous process of "deanthropomorphization" (or emancipation from human conceptions), and that the infinite and absolute cause of the universe, though unknowable, is yet manifested through the phenomenal world; though impersonal, is yet divine; and thus affords a basis for the harmony of science and religion, which may unite in recognizing it under the names of Nature and Deity. While such positivist philosophers thus differ in regard to some details, it will be seen that they alike ignore revealed theology, and in fact exclude all the metaphysical sciences from the realm of philosophy.

Let it, therefore, be premised that we are not about to assail this system on mere theological grounds. Such an argument might indeed be constructed, and one that would prove both valid and conclusive. The Positive Philosophy is notoriously open to the charges of atheism and infidelity. It not only makes no provision for a supernatural religion, but avowedly regards Christianity as only a remnant of the mythological era of history. To the Church it merely accords the merit of having served as a provisional institute in the process of its own development toward some future vague worship of Humanity or Nature. It would certainly be easy to accumulate objections of a religious character against a system so opposed to all the holier instincts of our nature, and so reckless of the entire evidence of divine revelation. There have not been wanting dissents of the kind even from those who could be suspected of no special interest in the theological profession. But the reasoning, sound as it is, can have no effect upon the disciples of Positivism, or upon any inclined to adopt its fundamental principle. According to that principle, theology itself, considered as a science of revealed truth, has been inductively demonstrated to be an effete superstition, no more worthy of scientific regard than mythology, of which indeed it is to be taken as only the last and highest development. Any argument, therefore, based upon theological premises, would be due, in the estimation of the Positive philosopher, to mere partisan adherence to a waning interest, and coolly accepted by him as an unconscious tribute to his own intellectual superiority.

For a similar reason, we do not now venture upon metaphysical premises, as defined by this system. Metaphysics, we are assured, must share the fate of theology. It is the peculiar boast of the Positive Philosophy that it subsists by a refutation of all other philosophies on strictly scientific grounds. It professes to have assailed and overthrown them with the hard facts of universal history and human nature, and to be already leaving them far behind it, in the wake of progress, as mere brilliant dreams of the childhood of science. The great body of metaphysicians are thus to find themselves in the same category with the theologians. It will be to no purpose that the spiritualist or the mystic should object to the materialistic and sceptical tendencies of the system, and demonstrate its utter incompetency to solve any of the great ontological problems of nature and humanity. The Positivist, in becoming a Positivist, has reasoned down all such inquiries as vain and puerile, and scorning to tread in any other path than that of solid facts, pretends to have mounted by the sure steps of induction to an eminence from whence he can proudly contemplate all the objections of reason and of faith, of religion and of philosophy, as mere vagaries of decaying superstition and prejudice.

In the present argument, therefore, we accept the only alternative which the disciples of this school seem disposed to leave us. We descend from the aerial regions of theology and metaphysics, upon the narrow arena of the Positive Philosophy itself, and take the weapons it would force into our own hands. It need not be imagined that we are only about to exemplify those "theological and metaphysical prejudices," which its admirers complacently dream it is destined to supplant, nor even that the merit of originality must belong to any one who attempts its refutation. Our apprehension is rather, that if Positivism could be made its own judge, it would pronounce its own sentence. In a word, we believe it possible to show that it proceeds upon the abuse of a sound method, and that the little truth it has gathered up into itself will alone suffice to refute its remaining error.

But what is the Positive Philosophy? In the main, it is that which is familiarly known among us as the inductive

philosophy. Comte himself frequently declares his system to be only the extension and completion of the Baconian method. His admirers are fond of styling him "the Bacon of the Nineteenth Century;" and in particular point with pride to his philosophy of the sciences as a second *Novum Organum.* We are not insensible either to the merits or to the defects of this portion of his labors. As a simple construction of the intellect, if not as a direct contribution to the philosphy of physical research, it has been pronounced by Morell "a masterpiece of scientific thinking." We cannot perceive, however, that what is true and valuable in it of necessity arises out of the accompanying speculations, or indeed that it constitutes the distinguishing feature of the system.

On the contrary, that distinguishing feature undoubtedly is, its attempted application of the inductive method to the phenomena of human intelligence, as displayed in history, with the view of discovering a law by means of which the natural process of science shall be ascertained and regulated. In other words, it aspires to be a philosophy of science based upon the history of science. It would apply the accumulated experience of the race to the great problem of determining what are the true limits, the method, and the goal of human knowledge. With this design it enters upon a survey of the course of man's speculative or intellectual convictions throughout all time, the result of which is the announcement of a grand law of scientific development, which all the most advanced sciences are declared to have observed in their progress toward exact, real knowledge, and which all the remainder must therefore, sooner or later, illustrate.

Now, before proceeding any further, we might here raise an objection of no little consequence. This proposed "law of the intellectual evolution of humanity," Comte would constitute the summary law of universal history, by means of which all its complex phenomena are to be explained. The entire social development, whether material, political, or religious, he would make to depend upon the development of science. He would thus not only render science the paramount interest, but actually involve every other interest, art, politics, and even religion, in the process of its evolution; so

that, as Mr. Mill expresses it, "Speculation, intellectual activity, the pursuit of truth, is the main determining cause of the social progress." But to this it might be objected, not simply that the speculative propensity is too inoperative, and restricted to too small a portion of mankind, to admit of such a predominance being assigned to it, but that, with all the potency which can be justly claimed for it, it is itself subordinate to other social agencies utterly beyond its control. In a word, we believe it could be shown, and that by strictly positive reasoning, that while the material progress of society does indeed depend upon its intellectual progress, yet its intellectual depends upon its religious progress, and its religious progress upon Providence. The effect of such an argument would be to conserve whatever of truth may be found embodied in Comte's "law of the intellectual evolution," and yet preclude the destructive errors which have resulted from his exaggerated estimate and perverse application of that law. To mention only a simple example, religion, and in particular, revealed religion, would then be made to appear as itself "the main determining cause," and not a mere accompanying effect of civilization. Without venturing, however, upon such inquiries, we now return to the consideration of the law itself.

The human mind, according to this law, invariably adopts three successive modes of explaining phenomena; first, by referring them to supernatural agents; then, to metaphysical entities; and at last to mere natural laws. These three stages of intellectual development, in the order named, logically and practically ensue upon each other, both in the race and in the individual, and are to be termed respectively, the theological, the metaphysical, and the positive stage. Let each be briefly characterized.

In the theological stage, it is the spontaneous tendency of mankind to attribute all phenomena to the arbitrary wills of supernatural beings. Such is the necessary point of departure for the human intellect; and three phases mark its development. At first, external objects in nature are conceived of by the wondering savage as animated with a life analogous to his own, and having a mysterious power over him for good or evil. This is fetichism, which is the grossest form of the theo-

logical instinct, and is illustrated by such of the human tribes as are still but slightly removed from animality. By degrees, however, through the generalizing and social faculties, these individual and domestic fetiches become grouped together under some more powerful fetich of the particular tribe, or department of nature to which they belong, and the mythical creature is endowed with attributes in keeping with the elements over which he is imagined to preside, or the interests he is supposed to subserve. This is the era of polytheism, when the woods are peopled with dryads, and the waters with naiads, and the heavens with the passions and graces, and all nature is alive with gods and goddesses. But at last the propensity to transfer human personality into outward objects, having mounted from one degree of generality to another with the increasing spirit of nationality and speculation, reaches its climax in monotheism, the doctrine of one supreme fetich or myth, by which all others are to be subordinated and rendered obsolete. The gods now disappear before the idea of Jehovah; the strife of contending powers in nature is harmonized in the notion of one absolute Will; and prayer aspires after the prize of universal control. This is the perfection of the theological spirit, and it is admitted to be an immense advance upon the gross materialistic pantheism in which it originated. Yet with all its unity and consistency, it must be regarded as a mere system of speculative opinions, by which society is for a time held together in the process of unfolding its own intellective capacity, and no more destined to permanence than either of the preceding phases of the same tendency. The god, in whose single will all phenomena have thus been colligated, is a mere product of human speculation, spontaneously exercising and developing itself through long ages, and by a combination of innumerable minds, from its first feeble glimmerings in the half-animal savage, up to its most brilliant surmises in the cultured sage or saint. And now the very agencies concerned in the elaboration of this august Abstraction, which men have learned to adore and love, must turn against it and effect its dissolution. For, of necessity it soon begins to be discovered, at first by the speculative class, and then through them by the masses, that there

are vast bodies of phenomena not under the regulation of a divine will, but simply of natural laws; and as this empire of natural laws is extended from one class of facts to another, that of a divine will, both in science and in practice, proportionably diminishes. Thus a new system of opinions is destined to gradually take the place of the old as the basis of a new social organization. But, in the mean time, there must exist some scheme of provisional conceptions by means of which the transition shall be effected; and it is this which constitutes the intermediate or second great stage of the intellectual evolution.

In the metaphysical stage, the primitive tendency to explain phenomena by supernatural agencies, is being steadily supplanted by means of a tendency to explain them by metaphysical abstractions. Such a revolution is necessitated by the advance of speculation; and involves the two-fold process of decomposing the old theological system, and preparing the elements of the new Positive system. Considered in its relation to the preceding and succeeding stage, it is, therefore, either a destructive or constructive agency. As a destructive agency, the metaphysical spirit exhibits three phases. At first, that freedom of individual inquiry, provoked and fostered by monotheism as distinguished from polytheism, gives rise to heresy and dissension, and the myth of a Supreme Being is consequently espoused by rival claimants. This is Protestantism, by which theology is driven to war with itself. Then, the critical spirit advances from heresy to infidelity, and for a divine person is now substituted a personification called Nature; for a divine will, the notion of a Providence submitting itself to rules; and for divine purposes in particular objects or events, the entities of causes, first and final. This is deism, by which theology is banished to the pulpit and the cloister. At last, a logical and systematic scepticism sweeps away all vestiges of supernaturalism, extirpates even the remaining abstraction of a great First Cause, reduces the notion of force or substance in phenomena to a mere scientific fiction, and leaves them wholly to the regulation of their own laws of co-existence and succession. This is atheism, by which theology is consigned to history as an extinct in-

terest. As a constructive agency, the metaphysical spirit, while in the act of disorganizing the old theological regime, is providing for the new Positive regime, by liberating those various industrial and speculative movements essential to such a reorganization. Thus is at length opened the way for the third and final stage of the great development.

In the Positive stage, the tendency to refer phenomena to supernatural wills, having been supplanted by a tendency to refer them to metaphysical causes, is now succeeded by a tendency to refer them to natural laws. Such is the inevitable terminus of the whole evolution, and herein must be sought its legitimate consummation. As it is necessary for humanity to begin with a supernatural explanation of the facts with which it has to deal, and proceed by a metaphysical explanation, so must it at last end with a purely natural explanation, wherein it shall be concerned solely with the facts themselves, as spontaneously displayed under their laws, and forever abandon all inquiry into their origin or causes as vain and puerile. But since the different kinds of facts vary in simplicity and generality, the different kinds of knowledge corresponding to them must proceed at unequal rates through the three stages, arriving at the final stage in the order of their relative freedom from complexity and specialness. Accordingly mathematics, having to deal with facts the most abstract and universal, and least exposed to theological or metaphysical perversion, was the first of the sciences to assume a character of Positivity. Astronomy, in consequence of its mathematical simplicity and generality, was the next to reach the Positive stage, having groped through the two preceding stages of astrolatry and astrology. Terrestrial physics, the simplest of the sciences after astronomy, is already emerging into a Positive form, though still hampered with some remnants of the earlier periods. Biology, however, being concerned with the more complex phenomena of organization, is as yet involved in metaphysical confusion, particularly in its psychological department; while sociology is totally enveloped in the primitive theological darkness; the most advanced thinkers still dreaming that the action of associated human beings is regulated by Providence or legis-

lation rather than by natural laws. But the sciences scale the summit of truth in linked series, each being helped forward by its predecessor, and bringing with it the pledge of its successor. The day must therefore come when even sociology, the last of the train, shall be planted on the same Positive eminence with mathematics and astronomy, and so enable us to resolve political questions with the same certainty as problems in mechanics, or predict the career of societies, in given circumstances, with the same precision that we now describe the orbits of the heavenly bodies. This will be the millennium of the Positive philosopher, wherein science shall take the reins of politics, shall teach art to subjugate nature, and idealize the triumph in creations of more than classic glory, and shall even regenerate religion itself, by rendering it the intelligent worship of that Humanity, whose wondrous knowledge, power, and goodness, were once embodied in the myth of a Supreme Being.

Such is an outline of Comte's law of the intellectual development of humanity, together with the tremendous conclusions pendant upon it. No one at all acquainted with it will deny that we have done it all the justice possible in so brief a statement. But, before we admit its scientific pretensions, what we have now a right to demand upon the grounds of Positivism itself is, that it be sustained by the "combined evidence of human history and human nature." These are all the conditions of such a law, as prescribed by Mr. Mill, (one of the warmest English admirers of the system); they are, moreover, the conditions to which Comte himself submits:—"From the study of the development of human intelligence, in all directions, and through all times, the discovery arises of a great fundamental law, to which it is necessarily subject, and which has a solid foundation of proof, both in the facts of our organization, and in our historical experience." And we see no particular reason to question the justness of these criteria. Certainly, if man does observe any such uniformity in his intellectual development as is supposed, it will not only be displayed by his actual history, but also appear to be involved in his very nature. Were either species of evidence wanting, the phenomena of his

being could not be made the subject of Positive science. We might show, from the history of humanity, that it has always pursued a certain career; but will this be its career in the future? Or we might show, from the nature of humanity, that it is necessitated to pursue a certain career; but has this been its career in the past? Should there be, however, a convergence of these inductions to the same purport; could we demonstrate that human history has always been what might be expected from our survey of human nature, and that human nature actually is what might be expected from our survey of human history, we might then be in a fair way of attaining a true scientific law, by means of which to account for the past, and foresee the future career of society. Whether such a law actually obtains and is ascertainable, we do not now inquire, but simply proceed to show that Comte has fulfilled neither its empirical nor theoretical conditions.

Of the former class of proofs, the first and most accessible would be afforded by individual experience. We should expect to find the alleged law of intellection actually illustrated in the development of the most scientific minds. Comte distinctly asserts this to be the case: "The point of departure of the individual and of the race being the same, the phases of the mind of a man will correspond to the epochs of the race. Now each of us is aware, if he looks back upon his own history, that he was a theologian in his childhood, a metaphysician in his youth, and a natural philosopher in his manhood. All men who are up to their age can verify this for themselves," p. 3, vol. i. The only proper answer to such an argument is obvious. The author of the Positive Philosophy may certainly be allowed to speak for himself, but not necessarily for the rest of mankind, nor even for the whole of that party who are unwilling to acknowledge themselves entirely behind the age. It is believed, there are still extant many eminent persons, in whom the theological and metaphysical spirit has not only survived the period of adolescence, but even the most mature attacks of Positivism itself.

The next source of empirical proof would be that afforded by the experience of the race. To establish this law, it would be necessary to show that the three periods have been

successively displayed in the actual history of humanity. The propriety of this test is recognized by Comte when he characterizes the ancient world as theological, the mediæval as metaphysical, and the modern as Positive. But it surely requires no great amount of historical erudition to expose the fallacy of such a generalization. If we have reference to quality or quantity, the theology and metaphysics of the present age will certainly compare with those of any primitive era. Who will pretend that the religious and philosophic instincts of humanity are on the decline, in presence of such gigantic systems as now prevail in modern Europe? On the contrary, it is indisputable that there never was a time when the speculative energies of the race were more absorbed in theological and metaphysical inquiries, or when theology and metaphysics were exalted to so high a rank in the scale of the sciences, or when they were so generally admitted to be among the legitimate pursuits of the human intellect. He must simply shut his eyes to the great mass of facts around him, who goes into history expecting to find it exhibiting this law of the three tendencies succeeding and exhausting each other. It is patent to the whole world that they all survive among us, and that their most violent collisions have not as yet resulted in the extinction of any one of the series.

How comes it then, that the modern Bacon should have run so blindly in the face of universal experience? Simply by culling the facts to suit his theory. There is no hypothesis which might not thus be established. The literature of historical science is replete with examples of such hasty and unfounded generalization. This of Comte is simply the last and most imposing of the train. His historical review, in support of his law of the triple evolution, even if it could be pronounced accurate so far as it goes, actually proves nothing as to the chief points in controversy, but is open to a valid and unanswerable objection from each class of his opponents.

On the one hand, the theologian may fairly object to it, that it is restricted to that very series of nations whose career is alleged to have been determined by a divine revelation and a supernatural Providence. It is observable that Comte does not pretend to look for any full illustration of his great law of

history beyond the boundaries of Christendom. The reason given for this limitation is, that oriental countries must be regarded as the seat of a kind of sporadic civilization, which, having been early detached from the more compact and continuous civilization of the West, was arrested in its development, and has ever since been left to run in the vicious circles of the primitive theological tendency. If we inquire how it happened that such a suspension of the law should have occurred only in heathen nations, while Christian nations have gone forward from the theological, through the metaphysical, toward the Positive state, we are answered with some imposing generalities about the effect of European climate and Caucasian organization on social development, together with a confession that the whole "question of the scene and agent of the chief progression of our race" is insolvable because premature or radically inaccessible. But this, even if it could satisfy a strict Positivist, will not satisfy a theologian. What would be his explanation we are relieved by the terms of the present argument from inquiring. Yet, the simple fact that he professes to have his own explanation, obviously imposes upon his Positive antagonist the alternative of driving him from the field with some counter explanation, or himself retiring into less debatable territory for the historical evidence of his theory. If humanity, independent of divine revelation, obeys his pretended law of human development, let him leave "the little Jewish theocracy, derived in an accidental way from Egypt," and go out into the broad field of universal history and there gather up the facts to verify it. Let him take some other form of fetichism or polytheism than that which came in contact with Christianity; for example, Asiatic or American mythology, and exhibit it to us as spontaneously developing into monotheism, and thence declining, through the metaphysical transit, into Positivism. Until this has been accomplished, the supernatural explanation must be allowed to hold precedence of the natural, and the whole argument from history, so far as theology is concerned, remain simply irrelevant.

Then, on the other hand, the metaphysician may pronounce it equally irrelevant as regards his position. It is to be re-

marked that Comte, not content with excluding all but Christian civilization from his estimate, also refuses to include in it any but physical subjects, or at least such as are in no sense metaphysical or supra-physical. His reason for this restriction of course is, that, according to his philosophy, the physical or inductive sciences alone are feasible. He maintains that no phenomena exist but such as can be subjected to the inductive method, and that no other method is legitimate. All supernatural or super-sensuous phenomena, such as would be displayed by a divine or human spirit, are fictitious; and all inquiry into the causes or essences of any phenomena, whether by revelation or intuition, is fatuitous, and to be stigmatized as mere infantine curiosity. Consequently, the only sciences which can be allowed to enter into his review are those of mathematics, astronomy, physics, physiology (including phrenology as the science of mind), and sociology (considered as the extension of physiology). As for the various psychical and revealed sciences, which have so long pretended to exist, they are to be accounted for by being ignored. In short, we are to look for nothing in all the history of human intelligence but the Positive sciences. This is certainly very convenient for the Positivist; but might not the metaphysician, if allowed thus to choose his facts, rebut the argument? It will be observed, that we are not now inquiring into the legitimacy or feasibility of any of the exscinded sciences, but are simply maintaining that, in view of their notorious existence in the most civilized nations, for anything that Comte's own argument could prove to the contrary, they may continue to exist, each in its own domain of facts, and with its own method of dealing with those facts. And now, when we unite the two abatements, which must thus be made, of the historical evidence adduced in proof of this law, into what a meagre compass do we find its voluminous pretensions have shrunken? It is neither proved to be the law of the development of the whole human race, nor the law of the development of the whole human intelligence, since there are confessedly vast portions of mankind and various bodies of knowledge which have never to any extent exhibited its operation. The very utmost that could be conceded to it,

would be that it is the law of the development of the Positive sciences, or, to speak more accurately, of the natural sciences, since they alone can pretend to have become Positive, Comte himself admitting that what are commonly regarded as the mental and moral sciences "have nowhere risen to Positivity except in his book."

But even that meagre concession cannot be made. Even that last slender foothold must be contested. The theory is actually unable to maintain itself on the ground of its own chosen facts. We deny that the natural sciences themselves have ever properly observed this law. Their history does not show that they have emerged into the final stage only by extinguishing the two preceding stages. It is not a matter of fact that the Positive spirit, in those fields of research where it has most predominated, has actually extirpated the theological or metaphysical spirit. We may take for our example the most Positive of all the natural sciences. As it respects the phenomena of astronomy, will it be maintained, that the tendency to refer them to mechanical laws has ever generally and permanently supplanted the tendency to refer them also to a Divine will, or to second causes? Individual exceptions indeed there always are; but have astronomers, as a class, been atheists and materialists, or have their most mathematical predictions had the actual effect, either in the scientific or the popular mind, of dissipating all religious belief in a Divine Maker of suns and systems, or suppressing all speculative inquiry into the mode of their production and development? Did Newton in the act of discovering the law of gravitation cease to be a theologian? Did Kant in the act of propounding his cosmic hypothesis cease to be a metaphysician? Or have theologians and metaphysicians themselves actually surrendered astronomy to Positive science? Has not astronomy become the very poetry of religion and philosophy? We are not concerned as yet to account for the fact, but the fact itself who will deny, that even amid the rigid geometry and mechanics of the heavenly bodies, where inflexible laws reign supreme, theology as of old still comes to adore, and metaphysics to speculate?

And the argument only cumulates as we descend to the

less Positive sciences of physics and physiology. However much such a result may have been apprehended, yet who will pretend it is actually the case that atheism and materialism have taken exclusive possession of the votaries of physical science? Have they not as a body set up the notion of Nature as a kind of "Unknown God," whom they are willing that theology should declare unto them? And do they not proceed in their researches by methods and upon hypotheses, which they confess that metaphysics alone can furnish them? What are their various theories of heat, light, electricity, organization and life, but the existing metaphysics of physical science? and what is their enthusiastic admiration of nature, but a kind of blind adoration of nature's God? We do not now explain this, but is it not the case, that there are often found among them as much practical religion and sound philosophy as among professional theologians or trained metaphysicians?

To all this may be added the conclusive fact, that in those nations and ages by which the Positive tendency has been most cultivated, the other two tendencies are still found flourishing unimpaired and unmolested. Where the natural sciences have reached the greatest perfection, there may also be seen, not simply in juxtaposition, but in logical combination with them, the theological and metaphysical sciences. Is theology on the decline in inductive England and America? Are metaphysics in their decadence in positive France? Do the Germans show themselves to be the least theological because the most metaphysical of modern nations? Or will it be asserted that because the present age is distinguishable for a predominance of the scientific spirit, it is also distinguishable for a decline of the religious and philosophic spirit? If it is remarkable for its marvels of physical research and material civilization, is it not equally remarkable for its expanded schemes of Christian philanthropy, and the formidable grandeur of its metaphysical speculations? And were we to ascend into that community of thinkers, who are held to express the foremost mind of the race, might we not find that so far from its being the paramount tendency of the human intellect to install Positive science as the sum of

truth, it is rather in danger of careering off with the Phaëthon of transcendental metaphysics, toward the abysses of a kind of crude and all-involving theology? Must not even Comte admit rivals in Hegel and Cousin?

We need not, however, pursue these inquiries. It is already sufficiently apparent what is the value of the historical argument for the system. It miserably fails in the very societies where it should be most conspicuously established; it arbitrarily ignores the very sciences it proposes to supplant; and, thus retiring into a mere corner of the vast domain of truth, there falls impaled upon the very facts it had gathered for its support. If "the evidence of human history" shows anything in regard to the question, it shows that the three tendencies, instead of opposing and destroying one another, have actually proceeded together in their development, over every field of research they entered, and are now to be found harmoniously coexisting in the most advanced nations, and the most accomplished minds.

But as yet we have considered only one branch of the reasoning by which, according to the terms of Positivism, this law must be verified. Even if we had found that member of the argument irrefutable, it would of itself prove insufficient until corroborated by the other member. The law must be upheld by their mutual support, or fall as the keystone with the arch into ruin. Though it had been shown that humanity has hitherto, in some societies, and in some sciences, exhibited the great triple evolution, this would not prove that humanity will hereafter, in all other sciences, and in all other societies, pursue the same course, unless it could also be shown that such a course is necessitated by its very constitution, and involved in its very procedure. Theology and Metaphysics might have become universally extinct, and Positivism universally predominant, yet it would still be a question whether those extinct tendencies would not revive, and either suspend, reverse, or radically change the whole social evolution. Before the argument can be considered complete, it must be made to appear resultant from the actual principles of human nature, or from the actual process of human intelligence, that the three stages should successively arise, surmount and

destroy each its predecessor. When "the facts of our organization" thus concur with "the facts of our historical experience," to show that it is the inevitable course of the race to proceed from a supernatural, by a metaphysical, toward a natural explanation of all phenomena, we may then regard the law as fully verified. But this concurrence is precisely what cannot be established. If we found the historical argument unsupported, we shall now find the theoretical or *à priori* argument a still more signal failure.

The position which must be maintained in such an argument is, that the three tendencies are antagonistic and irreconcilable. If the human intellect is necessitated to proceed from one to the other, it must be because they are mutually repulsive, and cannot in any form and to any extent be made to combine and coexist.

This position is taken by Comte when he defines them as "three methods of philosophizing, the character of which is essentially different, and even radically opposed;" and throughout his analysis he represents them as involved in a three-fold antagonism, intellectual, moral, and social, destined to issue in the utter extinction of theology, and the entire supremacy of Positivism, through the intervention of metaphysics.

Let us first consider the intellectual antagonism of theology and Positive science. This is alleged to arise out of the necessity for observing and explaining facts by means of theories, in order to attain real knowledge. During the infancy of reason and of society; mankind spontaneously resort to the hypothesis of a god, as a mode of accounting for all phenomena. But this hypothesis, so inevitable and useful for a time, ceases to be either necessary or tenable, when it is found that some phenomena can only be explained by means of natural laws which exclude the action of a divine will; and since other phenomena, still attributed to the divine will, may be presumed to observe similar laws yet to be ascertained, we are to conclude that the whole theory of a Deity and a supernatural world must ultimately be abandoned and rendered obsolete, like any other crude hypothesis which science has outgrown and exploded.

But, if we should admit that the Baconian method is thus to be taken as the spontaneous procedure of the whole human intelligence, and the only source of real knowledge, what evidence have we that the theological theory of the universe, so to call it, either is or can be assailed by any amount of Positive science? Wherein consists the incompatibility of referring the very same phenomena both to natural laws and to the divine will? or of referring to the divine will, not the phenomena only, but the laws themselves? What are all natural laws but mere uniformities which mark the action of the divine will? Because the Deity, in His voluntary determination of the coexistences and successions of certain phenomena, does not act capriciously but with an inflexible regularity, are we to conclude that such regularity inheres in the phenomena themselves by sheer chance or spontaneity, and that His continuous volition is not required for its maintenance? Or because we have ascertained that certain phenomena, once attributed to His direct agency, observe a fixed order in their occurrence, are we to infer that He has less to do with these than with others not thus orderly in their occurrence? Has He abdicated His empire wherever He has set up laws for its regulation? and must we take the existence of such laws to be demonstrative of His non-existence? The very contrary of this is demanded by our intellectual constitution. Natural laws cannot but be regarded as the most conspicuous evidences possible of the reality and presence of a divine will; and every advance of Positive science, so far from being an invasion of theology, is only a fresh demonstration of its validity; an additional proof that the intelligence displayed on the face of nature does not belong to nature itself, but shines through and from beyond it, out of that one Eternal Mind by which it is upheld and directed.

> "Calm, He veils His will in everlasting laws,
> Which, and not Him, the skeptic seeing, exclaims,
> 'Wherefore a God? The world itself is God:'
> And never did a Christian's adoration
> So praise Him as this skeptic's blasphemy."

The most Positive of the sciences may be cited in illustration. Are astronomy and theology, as embraced in one view, logi-

cally inconsistent or repellant? That some exceptional minds might take the discovery of such a law as gravitation to be proof that the hypothesis of a God is no longer necessary, may be admitted; but that this is the natural, or rational inference, can be shown by nothing that appears in a sound mental organization. On the contrary, since every law pre-supposes an intelligent law-giver, we are obliged to conceive gravitation itself as nothing less than the strenuous exertion of the Almighty will among the planetary masses, and the ultimate and simplest expression of eternal purpose in respect to their movements. Astronomy, so far from assailing theological convictions, actually upholds them with all the force of mathematical demonstration, by inviting us to reverently conceive of God Himself as that sublime Mechanician, who, on the theatre of immensity, and in view of all intelligent creatures, is solving the most stupendous problems of motion and matter that could be imagined; and every new planet or star gathered within its expanding horizon, is but a fresh accession to the evidence whereby "the heavens declare the glory of God."

Nor would the argument be weakened should we imagine other more complex phenomena, such as even the phenomena of society, becoming, as predicted by Comte, the subject of Positive science. The laws of social development, supposing such laws to exist, might be so well ascertained and defined as to enable us to project the course of civilization, in given circumstances, with scientific accuracy; yet this would not invalidate the hypothesis of a divine will as the source and animus of those social laws. It would rather demonstrate its existence where as yet it is scarcely more than presumed. It would simply show that the course of human history is not at the mercy of caprice or necessity, but that in Providence as well as in nature, throughout the spiritual no less than the material universe, the Infinite Will is everywhere guided by the Infinite Reason.

In short, it may be taken as an axiom, that Positive science, to whatever limit extended, could never impair the validity of theology, but must ever only strengthen its foundations and enlarge its domain. Though the process of referring facts to

laws had been carried to the extreme of some one summary law, by means of which the entire aggregate of phenomena could be explained, a divine will would not even then have become hypothetically unnecessary, but remain as that scientific postulate or ultimate fact upon which the whole fabric of human knowledge reposes, and without which it could have neither rational basis nor consistency. Still would it be the instinctive tendency of the human intellect to look up to God as that Infinite Lawgiver, whose potent volition pervades and conducts the mighty mechanism of the universe, and but for whose immutable purpose it would fall into chaos, or vanish like a dream.

In like manner, it may be shown that there is no moral antagonism of the two tendencies. It is asserted, that the sentiments inspired by theology, partaking of its own illusory and transient nature, are repugnant to other more rational and permanent sentiments evoked by Positive science. While the hypothesis of a God prevails, man draws courage and consolation from imagined access to a divine will, and believes himself capable of modifying the universe by means of his prayers. But this hope, so inspiring and salutary in an infantile stage of his development, he readily relinquishes for the more animating and reasonable prospect of modifying the universe by means of his own personal resources. "We find ourselves able," says Comte, "to dispense with supernatural aid in our difficulties and sufferings, in proportion as we obtain a gradual control over nature by a knowledge of her laws." He even intimates that the devotional spirit already languishes in scientific minds; and it is not too much for him to anticipate a period when the throne of grace shall have become as mythical as the oracle or the augury.

The shortest answer to all this is, that such a state of the moral constitution of man is simply impracticable, if not inconceivable. We may give imagination the wildest license; we may suppose all science and art carried to their utmost perfection; yet what would be the result? Our astronomy could not remedy the planetary disturbance it might predict; our meteorology could not improve the weather it might prognosticate; our physiology could not

avert the death it might explain; and even our sociology could not regenerate the civilization it might project. The acquisition of omniscience itself could not invest mankind with absolute "control over nature," or destroy their instinctive dependence upon God, but, if left without adequate religious support, would either whelm them in helpless bewilderment, or leave them, as conscious children of fate, to yield to death and danger like dumb cattle or crushed machines.

We may go even a step further, and maintain, that the theological spirit, instead of being supplanted, is actually invigorated by the Positive spirit. Not only does it assert itself in presence of nature's most inflexible laws, as when the Atheist cries to God in shipwreck, or the Christian prays for his daily bread; but it may draw new courage from its knowledge of those laws, and from the spectacle of that human prowess acquired through such knowledge. When we behold what interventions in the fixed course of nature our weak, blind Will can accomplish, shall we doubt that, in the event of an adequate spiritual emergency, any intervention would be too great for that Will which, not only itself lives in all natural laws, but is ever swayed by omnipotent and omniscient love? Shall we deem the possible with man impossible with God? Shall we not rather deem the possible with God impossible with man, and all the more readily believe, that the "modifications of the universe," just declared impracticable to human science and art, were once actually effected by divine knowledge and power, when the sun and moon stood still in the vale of Ajalon; when it rained out of the brazen sky of Carmel; when death was dragged in triumph after the fiery chariot of Elijah; and when Messiah came to regenerate by His Church the whole social development of mankind? The limited power of man over the universe only helps us to conceive of the unlimited power of God, and may but impel us to resort to Him in all the more confidence and hope. And though our spiritual exigencies do not require the miracles incident to less favored eras, yet may we still aspire after whatsoever things are in accordance with His will, and into that lofty region where His Spirit communes

with ours, ascend out of the rigid mechanism of nature, for such assurances and convictions as shall enable us to return and triumphantly withstand her most appalling terrors, or placidly yield to her most inevitable disasters.

Not even the supposed laws of history could oppose any barrier against such access of the finite spirit to the Infinite Spirit. We may imagine the course of Providence, in the direction of individual or social development, to observe uniformities as inflexible as those of mechanics; yet this need not shake our faith in the freedom either of human or divine volition. It would only convince us that the law of holiness is at least as fixed as the law of gravitation, and that spiritual death as inevitably ensues upon the infraction of the one, as physical death upon the infraction of the other. We should but be the better able to conceive of that God, with whom we have to do, as not less uniform in His determination of moral than of material phenomena, and find in His promises and provisions all the more rational basis for our prayers and hopes, whether for individual or social regeneration.

As positive science could never invalidate the ideas of theology, so it could never eradicate the instincts of piety. The spectacle of an entire universe under the regulation of laws, would not only be logically inconsistent, but morally appalling, without the notion of a Beneficent Lawgiver; and were it presented to the pious soul, instead of beholding in it a mere iron mechanism of fate, he would only regard it as an exquisite system of divine volitions, susceptible of being made to work together for his good, and of all its anomalies pronounce none so monstrous as would be that of a single legitimate prayer left unanswered, worse even than the sceptic's notion of a miracle, as appearing not simply a suspension of the laws of nature, but even of the will of God.

It would seem scarcely necessary now to argue that there can be no social antagonism of the two tendencies. This is admitted to be a mere consequence of their intellectual and moral antagonism. The war between them, in any society where it is waged, it is asserted, must issue in political revolution. So long as a theological theory prevails, and the consequent moral sentiments abound, the mass of individuals

spontaneously concur upon a basis of common opinions with some degree of stability, order, and peace. But no sooner do these fundamental opinions begin to be assailed by heresy, infidelity, and schism, than ancient institutions become unsettled, and society is at the alternative of continuing in anarchy, or assuming a new organization. According to Comte, the most civilized societies are now passing through this anarchical condition, consequent upon a decline of theological, and rise of Positive opinions, effected by the critical spirit of modern metaphysics; but it is his expectation that Positivism will ultimately so predominate over Monotheism as to place Christianity on a par with Mohammedanism, and at length consign the Church to antiquity, as a mere worn chrysalis, out of which civilization shall have struggled forth into new life and glory.

An argument which begins in absurdity, can only accumulate absurdity. This notion of substituting Positive for theological opinions in the social organism, is even more chimerical than that of substituting the scientific for the devotional spirit in the moral constitution. As yet, Positive opinions do not exist in the form of any such received body of doctrine, as could afford a nucleus for social concurrence; and were such opinions ever to predominate, they would prove, if not utterly fatuitous, yet thoroughly disorganizing. The picture, which Comte elaborates, of a new social organization resulting from such opinions, and composed of a race of virtual atheists, absorbed in the worship of their own humanity as a deity, cannot exist even in imagination without instantly dissolving into anarchy, or relapsing to barbarism.

Indeed, so far from admitting that theological opinions could ever be extirpated from the social constitution by Positive science, we might rather maintain that it is ultimately destined to strengthen and extend them. Truth, from whatever source it emanates, must yet be found consistent with all other truth; and were human knowledge thoroughly consummated and diffused, it would but demonstrate the God of nature and of history to be the God of revelation, with such universal and conspicuous illustration that all should know the Lord, from the least even unto the greatest.

The foregoing argument in respect to the relations of theology and Positive science has virtually secured that in respect to the relations of both to metaphysics. It is only on the supposition that the two extremes of the series are antagonistic, that the intermediate term could acquire any hostile bearing. That supposition having been disproved, we must regard the abstractions of metaphysics as comparatively harmless and inoperative. The mere theoretical substitution of the entity of "Nature" for the Deity, of "phenomena" for divine manifestations, of "cause" or "force" for the divine will, and of "laws" for the uniformities of divine action, instead of marking the deterioration of theology, is only to be taken as the convenient technicality of science; and heresy, infidelity, and schism, so far from decomposing the theological system of society, are but so many purgative processes, by which it is being cleansed and perfected. While, as respects the relation of metaphysics to Positive science, it would not be difficult to show that the progress of the latter actually depends upon the progress of the former; and that were both completed, they would acquire rational support and consistency only by means of theology; or, in other words, that the normal order of the three pursuits is the exact reverse of the order alleged, and that science, in escaping from the pupilage of theology, and passing under the discipline of metaphysics, does not then recoil with parricidal and suicidal blow upon the parent that nurtured her, and the master by whom she is trained; but is rather destined to return, though after long estrangement, and by a circuitous route, under the guidance of a sound metaphysic, back to the feet of that ancient theology from whose loins she sprang, and there unite in rendering the knowledge of man coincident with the knowledge of God and the truth as it is in nature, everywhere congruous with the truth as it is in revelation.

Upon such profound inquiries, however, we do not yet venture. We have now sufficiently examined both species of testimony adduced in support of this supposed law of intellectual development. It fulfills neither of the prescribed conditions of such a law. It is as wholly unsustained by the evidence of human nature, as we found it to be by the evidence

of human history. The facts of our mental, moral, and social constitution, concur with the facts of historical experience, in showing that the three pursuits, instead of waging exterminating warfare, are but so many allied interests of truth, equally spontaneous, legitimate, and permanent.

And now, were any illustration needed to confirm such an argument, where could we find a better than this very system itself? What is the "Positive Philosophy" but a product of the metaphysical tendency? What is the "Positive Religion" but a product of the theological tendency? And can we conceive of any abstractionism more wild than that which would construct the entire fabric of human knowledge out of an empty generalization of history? or of any fetichism more gross than that which, having studiously invested the notion of humanity with the attributes of Deity, would then invite mankind to love and serve it as their god? Thus, by a recoil of truth from beneath the foot of error, wherein something of the sublimity of retribution is joined to the rigor of demonstration, does this system not only fail on its own premises, but remain a conspicuous monument of the failure. Professing to deride theology and metaphysics, it stands forth as itself, in its own perverted sense of the words, the most metaphysical of all metaphysics, and the most theological of all theologies.

We ought not now to be charged with any undue theological or metaphysical prejudice in concluding this discussion with a single practical lesson to be learned by each of the two obnoxious professions from this system.

The metaphysician may find in it new evidence of the insufficiency of any one method of research as pursued to the exclusion of every other. If there is any one method, upon which it might seem safe to place such entire reliance, it is, perhaps, that inductive procedure which is the characteristic and the pride of the English mind. We have been wont to boast of the healthy appetite for facts, which it has fostered among us, and to congratulate ourselves on our consequent happy seclusion from the devastating career of foreign transcendentalism. All that was needed to undeceive us is a system like the one before us, avowedly proceeding on our favorite Baconian method toward the very worst results of German speculation.

The simple truth is, that while revelation, intuition, and induction, are equally legitimate, within their own appropriate spheres, yet, in the existing fragmentary and schismatic condition of human knowledge, neither can be pushed beyond the limits imposed upon it by the others, except at its own peril. Theology may not safely invade such a question as the antiquity of the globe, since that is a legitimate problem of Positive science; and Positive science may not safely invade such a question as the regeneration of society, since that is a legitimate problem of theology; and neither may safely invade such questions as the modes or relations of matter and spirit, since those are legitimate problems of metaphysics. Only when they shall have together accomplished their respective missions will the world be in possession of one homogeneous body of truth.

The theologian, in like manner, may only find in this system a fresh illustration of the tendency of depraved reason to dispense with the idea of God. Such is the perversity of man's intellect, that if able to account for the creation on any other theory than that of a Creator, he will disregard even the evidence of intuition and revelation. Hence we have that glorious idea, without which history were a blank and the world a wreck, represented to us as a mere product of the speculative propensity, to be traced back to its origin in savage superstition, and even in a supposed nascent theologizing among "some select animals," and then, in its mature form, to be treated as a mere tentative hypothesis, which the race is already in haste to abandon. But we need not fear that any amount of science and art could ever enable man, either in theory or in practice, to do without a God. The Deity is not so meagre in His resources, nor has He constructed the existing universe on such a diminutive scale, that His creatures can ever get beyond the necessity of admitting their ignorance and helplessness. Science after science may push its adventurous way into the arcana of nature, but it will only be to return with tidings of still unexplored regions of truth which it has not dared to invade even with the footsteps of a conjecture. Every earthly branch of knowledge might be carried to perfection, until the whole problem of the planet should be

solved; but there would still remain innumerable other orbs, of whose genesis and apocalypse we could not form so much as a conception. Philosophy might have dived down toward the eldest secrets of creation, and mounted up toward a solution of its whole complex enigma; but there would still remain even then the Creator Himself, capable of making and unmaking universe after universe to all eternity. Never, while man is man and God is God, shall mystery cease to hover between them, as at once a stimulus to the curiosity and a barrier to the pride of human reason. Before the seraph and the sage alike, is it the glory of God to conceal a thing.

CHAPTER III.

THE ABSOLUTE PHILOSOPHY OR THEORY OF OMNISCIENCE.

HAVING discussed the claims of the Positive Philosophy to an exhaustive theory of knowledge and complete system of the sciences, we proceed to consider that opposite theory and system, known as the Absolute Philosophy. It has been brought to a curious issue in the course of modern thought and research. Two rival schools, founded in different nations, and headed by the most powerful thinkers of the age, are pitted against each other upon the question whether such a philosophy is possible. The German philosophers not only include it among the legitimate pursuits of the human mind, but rank it at the very head of the sciences, as being their source, and embracing their whole content. The English philosophers, on the contrary, labor to prove it wholly illusive and futile, and insist upon limiting all rational research to the sphere of finite phenomena: while the French philosophers would seem to be more divided among themselves, both tendencies having been developed in an extreme form by the systems of Cousin and Comte. The Absolute Philosophy and the Positive Philosophy, or the Philosophy of the Infinite and the Philosophy of the Conditioned, as the opposite doctrines variously claim to be called, are in fact becoming the two poles of modern speculation, toward which, with different degrees of divergence, advanced thinkers in all lands are rallying. For so does thought from having been national grow to be catholic, and philosophy vindicate herself as the daughter of humanity.

What is more singular, the religious party cannot be said to have fairly committed itself to either extreme. In both schools the very same speculations are wielded for the defence and for the destruction of revealed theology. It is well known, for example, that the Hegelian philosophy of the Absolute became in the hands of one faction mere pantheistic infidelity, while another faction professed to find in it nothing less than a rational explanation of the most peculiar doctrines of Christianity. In like manner, the Hamiltonian philosophy of the Conditioned is taken by some late thinkers as the basis of a purely revealed divinity, while others are in haste to erect upon it, with the same logic, a mere scientific atheism. Between Marheinecke and Strauss of the one school, or between Mansel and Spencer of the other, there are really more serious differences than between the schools themselves; so diversely has each master been interpreted by his disciples. We by no means infer from this that the whole controversy is harmless or useless, but rather take it to be illustrative of an axiom dominant through all the sciences—metaphysical as well as physical—that in each of them may be found antagonistic theories neither of which is wholly irreconcilable with Scripture, but which, by their own mutual collisions, are destined to issue in its support and illustration. There is, indeed, too much truth, as well as error, involved in these formidable conflicts between the giant intellects of our time for the Christian theologian to think of either despising or disparaging them.

The whole subject, it is true, is both abstruse and hackneyed, and many, no doubt, have already retired from it as a mere labyrinth of wordy notions, into which whoever enters only becomes the more bewildered the farther he wanders. We are not so rash as to think of attempting, at this late day, any original route over the trodden field; but, it may be, that by taking a position somewhat above and beyond it, we shall not only gain a fresher and more comprehensive view, but be able at length to connect and complete the researches of other explorers. In other words, could the whole question be sifted from the literature which has been accumulating around it, and all possible as well as actual opinions respect-

ing it exhibited in some exhaustive synopsis, we should then have before us the materials for a final judgment.

Now it will be found that there are five, and only five, distinct questions which can logically be raised in reference to the Absolute: 1st. Is it conceivable? 2d. Is it credible? 3d. Is it cognizable? 4th. Is it revealable? 5th. Is it demonstrable? We name them in the order of their importance, and propose to pass briefly through the series, affirming each as the basis for affirming the next, until we reach the last, in which we hold that philosophy is destined to rest as the goal alike of reason and of faith.

The first problem relates to the conceivability of the Absolute. It is not whether the Absolute exists really and ideally, nor yet whether we conceive it as it really exists, but simply whether we can conceive it at all, in any form or to any extent. Is the Unconditioned an object of legitimate thought? Does the mind act illusively and impotently or sanely and vigorously when it strives to think of the Infinite?

This question is obviously fundamental to both religion and science, and strangely enough, has been answered negatively by the partizans of both interests. The religious wing of the Hamiltonians, while denying the conceivability of the Infinite, admit its credibility, and even maintain that it becomes an object of faith precisely because it cannot be an object of thought, or that faith is complemental to thought in practically apprehending it. "By a wonderful revelation," says Hamilton, "we are thus, in the very consciousness of our inability to conceive aught above the relative and finite, inspired with a belief in the existence of something unconditioned beyond the sphere of all comprehensible reality." And Mansel, on the ground of the same distinction, endeavors to conserve the interests not merely of piety, but of apologetics, by arguing that rationalism destroys itself in the very effort to think what cannot be thought, but must be simply believed. "We are compelled, by the constitution of our minds, to believe in the existence of an Absolute and Infinite Being,—a belief which appears forced upon us, as the comple-

ment of our consciousness of the relative and finite. But the instant we attempt to analyze the ideas thus suggested to us, in the hope of attaining to an intelligible conception of them, we are on every side involved in inextricable confusion and contradiction."

If our present argument were only with this division of the school, it would be enough to object that the reasoning, even if sound, must defeat its avowed aim. Like some blunderbuss whose rebound is more destructive than its projectile, it would prove entirely too much for all parties. Instead of conserving a revealed theology by destroying rational theology, it would simply undermine both, and render science and religion alike nugatory.

For what other effect could it have than to annihilate all faith, as well as thought, in respect to the Absolute. If the existence of an Infinite and Absolute Being is as inconceivable as that of a "circular parallelogram," it is surely quite as incredible. The incogitable cannot be other than also the incredible, since any mental object which contravenes the laws of thought must also contravene the laws of faith. He who dreams that he believes what he does not or cannot think, neither thinks nor believes at all, but only dreams. And when sane and waking men are found actually attempting to draw square circles or round squares, we may expect to find them believing in an Absolute, their conception of which is a mere bundle of contradictions, or "fasciculus of negations, bound together by the aid of language," but destined, like a torpedo, to explode at the touch of analysis in glaring absurdity.

It is no escape from this to distinguish the cogitable from the existible, and argue that "the impossible to thought" may still be "the possible in reality." We are not maintaining that our thought is a condition or criterion of existence, but simply that it is a condition or criterion of our faith as to what exists. The credible, if not bounded by the conceivable, is at least concentric therewith. If any choose to affirm that round squares or square circles are really possible in the sphere of objective existence, we insist that to us they are not credible, because not even conceivable; and, in like

manner, that our faith must revolt with our thought from an Absolute which is apprehended as self-contradictory.

Neither will it avail to say that belief in the infinite is a spontaneous act of the mind into which thought commonly does not enter, or which is compulsory upon us in spite of any thinking to the contrary. We doubtless have some intuitive convictions which no sophistry can shake, as, for example, our faith in the existence of an external world; but none of them, when excogitated, will be found to involve a negation or destruction of thought. Otherwise it would appear that we are subsisting upon plain absurdities with a nature divided against itself, or that we are constitutionally compelled to believe what, so soon as we think it, we are constitutionally compelled to disbelieve.

The whole argument, indeed, of the Hamiltonian divines, simply destroys itself by reducing them to a choice of inconceivabilities; or rather by developing, as an alternative, two other inconceivabilities, quite as revolting and absurd as the one they have alleged. We may retort, with their own favorite logic of contradictories: 1st. That it is inconceivable that we could believe what we cannot believe; and, 2d. That it is doubly inconceivable that God should be both the author and object of such impossible belief.

We do not, however, here insist upon this refutation, as it would anticipate our second problem, and is, moreover, conclusive only against one wing of the school. By far the most consistent party are those who boldly accept the issue, to which they are driven by their own logic, of a thorough scepticism, religious as well as scientific, in respect to the Infinite, and a consequent restriction of faith, no less than thought, within the bounds of the finite. And it is only when the reasoning assumes such a portentous import that it merits examination.

It may be questioned, however, whether there ever has been a metaphysical controversy in which such brilliant dialectics have been displayed, with no other effect than to leave truth worsted at the hands of logic. What unsophisticated mind imagines or spontaneously grants that its idea of the God it adores is a mere negation or absurdity? And yet,

once admit the specious premises of these logicians, and reason is drawn from her moorings into an insidious circle of thought which contracts as it proceeds, until, in spite of her recoil, she is engulfed amid the wildest contradictions. At one moment, it is maintained that our minds are finite, and therefore cannot conceive the Infinite; the next, that the conception of the Infinite, when analyzed, proves self-contradictory; and in fine, that these two propositions so corroborate each other as to force us into the dilemma of either believing the Infinite to be inconceivable or conceiving it to be unbelievable. We can escape the revolting conclusion only by strictly questioning each term and premise from which it is drawn.

Let it be observed that there are three distinct senses of the inconceivable: 1st. That of which we can have no notion whatever, which we cannot even attempt to think, but spontaneously pronounce unthinkable, or beyond the province of thought. 2d. That of which we can form only a self-contradictory notion, which we may attempt to think, but in the effort find to be destructive of thought. 3d. That of which we can form only a partial, yet still positive and consistent notion, which we may vigorously endeavor to think, but which will still baffle and overmaster thought, when tasked to its utmost capacity. It is only in this last sense that we admit the Infinite to be inconceivable. We do have some notion of an Absolute God, and a notion which, however meagre it be, is at least free from "contradictory opposites."

At the outset, it should not be forgotten that the conceptive faculty is not the same in all minds or moods, and must vary with the matter or object upon which it is exercised. When that object is the Infinite, though the most capacious mind, in its most elevated mood, should strive to conceive it, and though the conception formed, as far as it goes, should be an energetic affirmation of thought, yet must it nevertheless fall short of the transcendent reality. But such, also, must be our conception of the finite. The material universe, for example, as far as already explored, involves magnitudes of time, space, and force, quite as overwhelming as the infinitudes of divine eternity, immensity and omnipotence; or if

there be any difference, the latter ideas are really more positive and vigorous, if not more complete and precise, than the former, owing to the fact that they have contrasts in our own personal consciousness, by which they are thrown into relief as objects of distinct apperception, rather than of sensuous imagination.

So long, then, as the inconceivable is held to be merely that which transcends thought in its legitimate exercise, there need be no argument; but when it is defined to be that which actually contravenes thought, or that which thought itself excludes by its own action as self-contradictory, and to it impossible, then a very different question is presented. While admitting that our conception of Deity is, and must ever be, only approximate, we must still insist that, besides being positive, it is perfectly congruous or consistent, and that the contradictions alleged to be involved in it are purely imaginary. This will appear, if we carefully sift the several notions of infinity, absoluteness, and causality into which that conception is analyzed by these thinkers, and which are pronounced by them to be irreconcilable.

Now, it is admitted even by Hamilton, that the Absolute and the Infinite are, from one point of view, two consistent, though distinct phases of the Unconditioned: "The unconditioned, in our use of language, denotes the genus of which the Infinite and Absolute are species. The term absolute is of a twofold ambiguity, corresponding to the double signification of the word in Latin: 1. *Absolutum* means what is freed or loosed; in which sense the absolute will be what is aloof from relation, comparison, limitation, condition, dependence, &c. In this meaning the Absolute is not opposed to the Infinite. 2. *Absolutum* means finished, perfected, completed; in which sense the Absolute will be what is out of relation, &c., as finished, perfect, complete, total. In this acceptation—and it is that in which, for myself, I exclusively use it—the Absolute is diametrically opposed to, is contradictory of, the Infinite." It is therefore only when the words are taken in their secondary and less obvious sense, that it is pretended they are conflictive. We may, however, not only choose for ourselves the primary definition as being more pertinent, but also object to

the secondary as faulty, as, in fact, presenting merely "two opposite poles of the conditioned," rather than two distinct phases of the unconditioned. The "finished" and the "unfinishable" plainly involve some material image, as the subject of which the *quasi* infinitude and absoluteness are to be predicated, and if admissible in our conception of the universe, must obviously be excluded from that of Deity.

Both Hamilton and Mansel, and after them Spencer and Fiske, have persistently argued that thought itself is finite, and therefore cannot traverse the Infinite, and that consciousness involves the relation of subject and object and therefore cannot, without contradicting itself, embrace an absolute object out of relation to its own subjectivity. But such logical puzzles do not occur to common minds, and are practically refuted by an immense number of philosophic intellects to whom they seem little more than a mere play upon words. The fact remains, that, in conceiving of the Infinite and the Absolute, the thinker simply includes himself in the totality of existence, without for one moment imagining that he stands apart as a relative subject distinguished from an absolute object, still less as a creature existing independently of the Creator. And to say that such thought is impossible or absurd would be like saying that one could not conceive of the house he inhabits without going outside of it.

All the contradictions which have been alleged, disappear the moment we take the Absolute to mean that which is absolved from any necessary relation to the finite, and the Infinite that which is unlimited, in comparison with the finite; the former being a difference in kind, and the latter in degree, between the human and the divine spirit or person. The two notions, so far from being oppugnant, will, then be found complemental. In the supporting idea of personality as their ground and cement, they at once cohere and coalesce to form one conception. Though our thought might indeed be baffled and exhausted, were it to pursue either of them apart, yet while endeavoring to unite them, it encounters no contradiction between them, and instead of withering up and collapsing amid blank negations, really finds itself grasping the most complete positives within its reach. The Absolute and

the Infinite are, in fact, but divine attributes or properties which we contemplate in another Person, as the contrasts and correlates of our own human dependence and finitude; and the consistency of the two latter ideas is not more obvious in our consciousness of self than is the consistency of the two former in our conception of God as an objective reality, We simply apprehend ourselves as at once finite and dependent, and then, as opposed to this, affirm in thought the possibility of Another who is at once infinite and absolute. The two inconditionates, when thus defined, if they are partially inconceivable in the sense of surpassing thought, yet they are, at least, not utterly inconceivable in the sense of extinguishing thought; but are rather, when viewed apart, like asymptotical lines, which can neither meet nor clash, or, when viewed together, like concentric circles, whose very perfection precludes their conflict.

In like manner, it might be shown that the remaining notion of causality only adds to the consistency of the other two notions, when they are rightly adjusted one to another. Although an origination of the universe by an Infinite and Absolute Person, were it perversely conceived of by us as necessary, might, indeed, seem to violate both His absoluteness and His infinitude, yet when it is conceived as wholly voluntary, it can only, in our view, conserve and manifest them both, ensuring not less the dependence of creation than the independence of the Creator. In attributing personality to God, we include that volition from which we have our idea of causality, and associate with it, in contrast with our own conditioned will, His infinite energy and absolute purpose.

Thus the three ideas really demand and support each other; and so far from being mere "counter imbecilities of the human mind," are, in fact, the most consistent energies of which it is capable. We never think so positively, vigorously, and coherently, as when we steadily grasp and combine them in one conception; and of all conceptions that we can frame, there is none which so satisfies, while it exhausts the capacity of thought. When contemplating an Infinite and Absolute Creator in relief from His finite and dependent

creation, our ordinary consciousness is released and expanded to the utmost in the effort to apprehend the glorious object. As the mariner, sailing out from land into the shoreless ocean, we let go our hold upon the conditioned, and turn away to confidently affirm against it the unconditioned, losing even ourselves the while in the infinite, the absolute and the eternal. It may then be said, not less philosophically than devotionally, that the soul is forsaking the things of time and sense to be wholly occupied with God, and, like an eagle basking in the empyrean, becomes absorbed in the vision of ineffable glory.

It has now become apparent how the supposed contradictions have arisen. In part they are owing to a perverse habit of treating these divine attributes as mere abstractions, or predicating them of some vague substratum of the phenomenal universe, or of the universe itself, rather than of a conscious spirit or person, distinct from the universe; and also, to a failure in distinguishing, in kind as well as degree, the divine person from the human. So long as we endeavor to conceive some dead substance, or blind force, or bare cause, matter, space, time, the universe, in short, aught but a personal God, as infinite and absolute, or so long as we endeavor to conceive a God who is infinite and yet not absolute, a mere *anima mundi*, or a self-developing world, we cannot but involve ourselves in absurdity, for the simple reason that we are vainly striving to merge the spiritual in the material, the unconditioned in the conditioned, the Creator in the created. But so soon as we admit the idea of a person or spirit in place of a mere substance, or cause, or vague being, and then add the further ideas of a personal independence in contrast with our personal dependence, and an infinite degree of all personal attributes in contrast with the finite degree in which we possess them; at once the whole group of else contradictory notions resolves itself into logical unity, and we have before us a conception, which, beyond all others possible to the human mind, will stand the test of analysis. The revealed Jehovah is, in fact, identified as the only rational Absolute, Infinite, and First Cause; and we can pronounce it not more sound in theology than in philosophy, to conceive "a Spirit

infinite, eternal, and unchangeable, in His being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness, and truth."

Our conclusion, then, is, that while some modes of conceiving infinity, absoluteness and causality, may be contradictory, and while all modes of conceiving them must be more or less defective, yet that conception in which they are brought together as attributes of a Divine Spirit or Person, is not only a positive and congruous effort of thought, but, when compared with others, is the most logical which the mind of man can grasp.

The second problem relates to the credibility of the Absolute. Does it exist really as well as ideally? When we conceive it, do we conceive what actually exists? Does our subjective idea of the Infinite find support in any objective reality? Is the Unconditioned a mere magnificent abstraction, projected as the shadow of our own consciousness, or a glorious Person existing outside of our consciousness? Can we believe in such an Absolute and Infinite Spirit as we have conceived?

This question is also fundamental to both religion and science, and, in like manner, has sometimes received a negative answer from both parties. The whole religious wing of the Kantian school, while denying the credibility of the Absolute, have maintained its conceivability, and even insisted that it becomes an object of thought simply because it must cease to be an object of faith or that our implicit faith in it as an objective reality expires through the explicit thought of it as a mere subjective idea, generalized from the finite and contingent. It was by means of this distinction that some devout disciples of Fichte, Schelling and Hegel, were fain to deify the abstraction of universal being, to worship the All-One as God, and to erect a kind of speculative theology upon the ruins of all practical religion.

Of such a religious system it would be enough to say that it cannot accomplish its own aim. Whatever other purpose it might serve, it could not sustain and foster the sentiments of religion. The adorable must at least be the credible. We can only worship what we believe to exist, as exterior and

superior to self; and if the Infinite cannot be believed to exist, within our finite self or in finite nature around us, then it can only be worshipped, if worshipped at all, as an extra-human and extra-mundane reality, surpassing both man and nature, in power, wisdom and goodness. When any pantheistic idealists are found consciously loving and adoring the abstractions of their own understandings, we may accept for genuine religious feeling, their delusive apprehension of an Absolute Deity produced by human intelligence alone or by the logical development of an impersonal, universal Reason.

Without pursuing this argument, however, we pass to the more consistent Kantians, who would not only ignore the Absolute as an objective reality, but retain the subjective notion or idea merely as a necessary postulate of philosophy, and so present the simple alternatives of idealism or realism in science and atheism or theism in religion.

To any but a thoroughly artificial mind such a question might, indeed, in its very statement, seem too revolting as well as absurd, for serious discussion. How warped the intellect that would reduce the idea of God, that idea which, beyond all others, has operated upon mankind with the force of reality, to a mere abstraction or regulative notion! And how sophisticate the conscience that for the worship of such a Being would substitute mere enthusiastic love of nature, or proud apotheosis of self! And yet, for such a barren crown as this, a host of astute dialecticians have entered the speculative arena, and striven with pitiless logic, in the face of reason, instinct, and common sense. Foremost of these champions of the pure idealism came Fichte, annihilating all objective reality; then followed Schelling, annihilating all subjective reality; at length appeared Hegel, annihilating both as distinct realities, and preserving only their residual relations; and meanwhile have appeared Schopenhauer, Hartmann, and Bahnsen, undermining all these systems as the mere human conception of a universe which has its root in blind force and its flower in conflicting will and reason. We shall best rebut such perverse disputings by simply asserting against them the several grounds of that catholic realism which underlies alike all science and religion as the only rational postulate of philosophy.

In the first place, a firm basis for the credibility of the Absolute has been already laid in our doctrine of its conceivability. We do not mean that it is of necessity credible, simply because it is conceivable, but only that its conceivability is an indispensable condition of its credibility. It could not be believed if it could not be conceived. Belief in it involves no obvious or latent contradiction, but is rather a belief, to say the least, the contrary of which cannot be proved.

In the second place, it takes rank as an instinctive conviction or primary belief. Instead of resulting, like some convictions, from mere speculation, or reasoning, or education, it has the marks of spontaneity, universality, and necessity. The moment the Infinite is conceived, it is instinctively apprehended to be objectively real. As in the very act of conceiving an external world all unsophisticated minds spontaneously attribute a reality to it from which they cannot escape, so in the very act of conceiving a god, they spontaneously attribute to it, not bare reality only, but personality, that form of reality suggested by their own consciousness, and the most substantial of which we can have any notion. It is only by some subtle logic that either of these primitive convictions ever becomes dissipated. The feeling of dependence upon an exterior and superior somewhat, which they call God, distinct alike from self and the world, is found in all mankind, and may be classed among the normal sentiments of the race.

In the third place, such belief, beyond all other instinctive convictions, proves to be indestructible and cumulative. The idol, or myth, or abstraction, in which it has expressed itself, may be destroyed, but it will still survive, and through some new and more consistent conception of the great Reality, feel after Him, if haply it may find Him. Even when it is brought reflectively into distinct consciousness and logically investigated, it not only asserts itself against all adverse reasoning, but admits of elucidation and ever-growing proof. Argument after argument may be accumulated to show that our spontaneous apprehension of God as a real existence is no illusion, until faith shall amount to assurance, and instinct be exalted into knowledge.

In short, philosophically speaking, the credibility of the Absolute, as of all objective reality, may be said to be in exact proportion to its conceivability. That we can no longer believe in the pagan or classic deities as the true and living God is simply because we can no longer conceive them as such. And if our conception of an Infinite and Absolute Creator can be shown to be absurd or self-contradictory, then we must either wholly renounce our faith in such a being, or we must seek new support for our faith in some conception which we can affirm to be sound and consistent, as well as supported by a correspondent objective reality. We are, however, trenching upon our next topic.

The third problem relates to the cognizability of the Absolute. Does our subjective idea of the Infinite correspond to the objective reality? In so far as we can conceive it, do we conceive it as it really exists? Must our cognition of deity be wholly illusory, like the vision of an object by a distorting eye or through a discolored medium? or may it become clear and exact, as far as it extends, however limited? Can we know the God in whom we believe?

This question, too, we must insist, is equally momentous in both its religious and scientific bearings. The attempt is indeed made, by both Kantians and Hamiltonians of the religious side, to distinguish between a speculative and regulative knowledge of the Absolute, or between its cognizability and its revealability, and while denying the former and retaining the latter, to erect the revealed theology on the ruins of all rational theology. It is argued by such thinkers that, as the Infinite God cannot be conceived, but must be simply believed, He is therefore of necessity, in accommodation to our faculties, revealed to us in a human form, under gross finite images, and that this revelation, though sufficient to regulate our religious worship and practice, neither itself amounts to a true knowledge, nor can by any effort of reason be made to yield aught toward a science of the absolute.

But it may be said of such, as of all indirection, that it creates worse difficulties than it attempts to solve. We do not speak merely of the intellectual and moral duplicity

which it would substitute for an unsophisticated faith in the inspired representations, but also of its fatal bearing upon inspiration itself. A God that could not be known, could not be revealed, for the simple reason that the revealing process from without involves the cognitive process from within, or is itself but the making known to, and through, the human intellect, what would else be unknown. Surely if, like the Samaritans, we "worship we know not what," or, like the Athenians, we worship only an "unknown God," then, revelation has become to us either useless or worse than useless. Our ignorance, in so far as it is unconscious, is little better than heathen blindness; or, in so far as it is conscious, has nothing to boast over the classic idolatry. Let such "too superstitious" Christians receive as a rebuke what the Apostle to the Gentiles first uttered as a gospel, "Whom ye ignorantly worship, him I declare unto you," and learn anew that lesson of the great Teacher to those who had corrupted an existing Scripture: "We know what we worship: God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth."

It was charged by Hamilton, that Kant "had slain the body, but had not exorcised the spectre of the Absolute; and this spectre has continued to haunt the schools of Germany even to the present day." But it may now be charged upon Hamilton himself, that in his zeal to exorcise the spectre, he has but mangled the body of the Absolute, and left the remains of philosophy in the hands of infidels. Between the Hegelian universe of bare ideas and the Comtean universe of dead facts, there is, in sooth, as little to choose as between a ghost and a corpse. We shall escape both horrors only when the real and the ideal absolute are combined in Jehovah, and science as well as religion has learned to recognize a living Creator, inhabiting and controlling His whole creation.

The more consistent disciples of the agnostic school, instead of attempting any vain distinctions, maintain the Absolute to be wholly incognizable, either through reason or through revelation, for the purposes of philosophy or of piety, and, renouncing all efforts to apprehend or represent the unknown cause of the universe, follow out their logic to the

extreme of a thorough nescience and neglect of the Godhead. In other words, while admitting the possible existence of the Infinite, they insist that it can neither be known nor worshipped, and that finite phenomena alone can become the object of science or of practice.

By far the most logical application of this doctrine, which the world has yet seen, or is likely to see, is to be found in the positive philosophy and religion of Comte. In that system the theory of the Unknowable is driven with remorseless rigor into the abyss of a scientific scepticism. Not only is the supposed Creator of the universe ignored as incognizable, but the whole existing conception of such a being is accounted for as in part a mere personification, and in part a mere hypothesis, which has grown out of the historical development of religion and science, and which originates in a primitive tendency of mankind to conceive external realities on the conditions or in the light of their own consciousness, under a human form, as animated with will or personality. Already this anthropomorphic tendency has impelled them through the successive phases of fetichism, polytheism, and monotheism, and the myth of a Jehovah which still survives in the vulgar mind, will only have become obsolete, when a perfected humanity, through science and art, shall have learned experimentally to realize its own ideal of power, wisdom, and goodness, instead of personifying and worshipping it as a Creator and Preserver of the universe, or identifying it with the unknown and unknowable Cause of phenomena.

If it had been intended, by this system, to ingeniously invert every axiom and instinct, it may be doubted whether the success could have been more complete. In what sound mind has the notion of a First Cause been thus resolved into a scientific fiction or devout self-personification? And how morbid must be that horror of blindly worshipping God in the form of man, which can only relieve itself by knowingly worshipping man in the form of God! And yet to compass these results, the whole field of knowledge has been laid under contribution, and the march of history toward them clothed with the precision of an inflexible law. The sciences, it is inductively shown, from their structure and development,

are destined to destroy and ignore the very idea of Deity, and in its place to substitute that of humanity, as the only reality which can either be known or intelligently worshipped. Preposterous as may seem such conclusions, we cannot escape them unless we boldly seize and sift the premises from which they are deduced.

And if we should grant that the Absolute is incomprehensible, it would not follow that it is incognizable. Our knowledge of the Infinite, though it can never be exhaustive or complete, may still be real, as far as it extends. We are not reduced to the bare alternatives of omniscience or nescience. Although unable to know everything, we still may know something in respect to the reality we call God, and this knowledge, however limited, may be a positive advance beyond ignorance or error. If it is partial and liable to correction or corruption, so also is all other knowledge. The same reasoning, indeed, which would assail the former must assail the latter, and, if successful, would only envelop all external reality in harrowing uncertainty. We could not tell whether the veiled Isis, before which we cowered, were spectre, fiend, or hollow nothingness; but would be full of

> "Blank misgivings of a creature
> Moving about in worlds not realized."

Let him believe who can, that the foundations of his consciousness are laid in delusion and imposture. We may grant that in one sense we must ever know the Infinite as still passing knowledge, but surely we need not on that account despise or renounce what knowledge we have.

Neither would it follow that the Absolute is incognizable, if we should admit that our conception thereof is in some respects human, derived from our own personality, or howsoever derived, found analogous to that personality. We may fearlessly accept the imputation, and still insist that the Incomprehensible Reality behind all phenomena as their ground or cause, is actually what we conceive it to be, a Spirit, having, like us, spiritual attributes, but, unlike us, having them infinitely and absolutely. What if it be true that we are constitutionally impelled to apprehend and represent the Original Cause of phenomena as an intelligent Creator, and ourselves

as His intelligent creatures? It is one thing to say that we have made to ourselves a god in the image of man, but quite another thing to say that we have ourselves been made in the image of God. On the latter supposition, theism becomes part of the natural realism of mankind, and, instead of being classed with outworn superstitions, may be taken as that true knowledge of the true God, of which all pantheism, polytheism, and the grosser monotheism, are but counterfeits and approximates.

Thus defined and guarded, the cognizability of the Absolute may be maintained by several considerations:

And, in the first place, still resuming and carrying forward our previous reasoning, we affirm it on the grounds of its conceivability and credibility. As all knowledge proceeds from the thought, through the faith of the thing apprehended, and so involves both thought and faith as its preliminary conditions, we have but to show, as has been done, that the Infinite may be conceived and believed, in order to show that it may also be known. In other words, the impossibility of such knowledge cannot be proved without first proving the impossibility of such conception and belief, or without assuming a science of the possibilities lying beyond all conception and belief; in short, without assuming omniscience itself. He must have known God completely, who would prove that we cannot know Him partially, or that, as far as we know Him, we do not know Him truly.

The advocates of the so-called relativity of knowledge have quietly assumed what they cannot prove, that our finite cognition of the Infinite Reality called God, is not based upon a real analogy. By their own showing, they cannot go behind phenomena and prove the contrary. For anything they know, the Original Cause of the universe may be a Divine person to whom we bear an approximate likeness. As actually manifested through the phenomenal world, the Absolute is recognized as at least possessed of intelligence, like our own, though infinitely greater in degree. Whoever denies this, can only be characterized as an atheist. If one of the conscious watches, imagined by Mr. Spencer, should declare that the watchmaker did not even have brain enough to make a

watch, it would deserve all the vituperation which any other more sensible watches could heap upon it.

In the second place, such cognition has the certitude appertaining to other cognition. We may know God, at least as certainly as we know the world. We may know that we know Him. As we cannot suppose that external realities in general are positively misrepresented to us in the process of our own intelligence, without thereby supposing that our whole nature is rooted in falsehood, and all knowledge mere delusion, still less can we suppose that the intimate and homogeneous reality of God is so misrepresented to us, since that would impugn the veracity of consciousness where its testimony is most direct, explicit and essential. In such knowledge we are in fact in immediate contact with an Infinite Spirit, from whom our finite spirits cannot escape, whithersoever they may flee; while in all ordinary knowledge we are cognizing existences indefinitely extended away from us in space and time, and presented to us under endless variety and vicissitude. Surely if directness, simplicity, and purity, in our apprehension of reality, be marks of true cognition, we may rely upon what we can know of God, however little it be. We say nothing as yet of the veracity of revelation as combined with the veracity of consciousness in affording a still farther and peculiar ground of certitude; nor of a subjective illumination as ensuring, in connection with that objective revelation, the ecstatic vision of the Absolute.

In the third place, such cognition imparts oneness and consistency to all other cognition. We cannot know the world as a whole, unless we know somewhat of God. An Infinite and Absolute Person, whose intelligent will is expressed through the laws of all phenomena as their first and final cause, is a fundamental, necessary postulate of science, without which it would remain a mere mass of fragmentary knowledge, devoid of rational coherence and unity. As the universe, the totality of existence, acquires intelligibility, becomes a cosmos instead of a chaos, only when it is viewed as the creation of a Creator, so the sciences can only be resolved into a system by means of theology. The law of their development is precisely the reverse of that maintained by the

Comteans, as might be shown, both from their structure, and from their history.

In fine, the cognizability of the Absolute, like that of all other reality, is proportioned as well as conditioned by its conceivability and credibility. Only when we shall have lost all thought and faith can we also lose all knowledge of God. Though our conception of Him must indeed be human, and our belief in Him mainly spontaneous, yet both these are themselves a spiritual endowment and heritage, which may be either wasted or improved. They are, in fact, but the image of the Creator constitutionally impressed upon His creature. As the boundless cope is mirrored in a dew-drop, so does man reflect even Deity in miniature; and according as he becomes conscious of that finite similitude, may he become cognizant of the Infinite Original. He may indeed have lost the likeness, and with it the knowledge of God in idolatrous superstition; he may even have obliterated both by sophistical philosophy or moral debasement; but he may also be "renewed in knowledge after the image of Him that created him."

Let us not, however, forestall our remaining discussion. We have maintained that a science of the infinite is as feasible as a science of the finite, and that, in fact, the former is indispensable to the latter. But there is this important difference between them:—Whereas, in our cognition of the external world, the subject is cognitive while the object is simply cognizable, yet in our cognition of God, both subject and object, the finite spirit and the Infinite Spirit, are interchangeably cognizable and cognitive. According to the strict absolutists, the finite spirit may even become identical with the Infinite Spirit, and theology be actually absorbed in psychology. According to the strict conditionists or positivists, the two are heterogeneous, and theology must therefore be isolated from psychology, and abandoned as a region of pure faith or mere conjecture. Between these extremes lies the true doctrine, that the finite spirit and the Infinite Spirit, although distinct and unequal, are nevertheless homogeneous and inter-cognitive, and consequently that psychology and theology are concentric, and ideally or ultimately coincident

spheres of knowledge and faith, reason and revelation, science and omniscience. In other words, our knowledge of the Creator, in distinction from our knowledge of the creation, is such as one person may have of another person through a process of mutual intelligence or recognition. We sustain personal relations to an Absolute mind, who is Himself cognizant as well as cognizable, and whom, though, now we know only in part, we shall yet know even as also we are known.

This distinction brings us to the verge of the next general topic propounded, and by means of it we now emerge upon ground more open and familiar than that over which we have been groping.

Our fourth problem relates to the revealability of the Absolute. Can such a Spirit make himself known to us, as well as be known by us? May the Infinite mind disclose itself to the finite mind? Must all our knowledge of Deity be derived from our subjective reason? or may it be purged and extended by an objective revelation? Has the "unknown God" been made known?

In reference to this question, the attempt has been made to disjoin the sphere of science from that of religion. One religious division of Hegelians, though nominally adhering to the revealed Jehovah, still pursued the rational Absolute independently, with more or less rigor, whithersoever their logic would take them, and some even maintained that the former is only to be retained as a kind of exoteric and mythical deity of the vulgar, while the latter alone is that pure reality discerned by the privileged circle of philosophers. It was with such subtle ambiguity that the most familiar dogmas of Christianity were held as philosophic formulas. The trinity of Father, Son, and Spirit, became travestied under the triplicity of the dialectic process; the incarnation was viewed as the reason embodied in all mankind, though best exemplified in the individual Christ; and the atonement as the reconciliation of this finite reason with the Infinite Reason.

Of this covert rationalism it is enough to say, that it is fatal to the interest it pretends to preserve, and all the more mischievous because of its orthodox disguise. In connection

with such a thoroughly rational theology, there could not be any strictly revealed theology. If the God of Scripture is to be taken as a mere symbol, or witness, or harbinger of the God of philosophy, all revelation, in any proper sense of the term, is undermined. For how could the revealable be at the same time the discoverable? or that which might have been positively concealed by the Infinite Mind be disclosed by the finite mind? "Who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been His counsellor?" It was this impious attempt to prejudge, on grounds of mere reason, the content of revelation, which gave to Germany a piety professing the form of godliness, but denying the power thereof, and multiplied in her churches the false apostles of another gospel, which is not another.

And hence we must regard as by far the most consistent rationalists those who avow hostility to evangelical truth, and boldly proffer their philosophical atheism or pantheism in place of the biblical theism. What was it, indeed, but the logical issue of pure rationalism which Christendom beheld, when the whole historical as well as doctrinal system of Scripture was assailed by the criticism of Strauss, and its Jehovah exhibited as but a Hebrew Jove, its Jesus as but a Jewish Socrates, and even its gospel as only a Christian legend. Malicious as the caricature seemed, yet it had at least the merit of candor, and exposed the seeming angel of light in the naked deformity of sin. Christianity is but betrayed with an Iscariot kiss by a philosophy which couches infidel sentiment in Scripture phrases and ancient formulas; but when the issue is boldly made between a god of reason and a god of revelation, then we know where and how to meet it.

And, in the first place, that the Absolute is revealable ensues upon our whole previous argument. If it could not be known, and known as a person or spirit, it could not be revealed, but since the Reality is both cognizable and cognitive, a positive and objective revelation is not impossible. Only upon the assumption that the unknown God is Himself unknowing or unknowable, can it be argued that it is impossible either that He should be made known, or should make Himself known.

In the second place, there is in human reason a necessity for such a divine revelation. We do not mean that all rational theology is impossible or nugatory, but simply that it must be imperfect and erroneous until corrected and matured by revealed theology. This may be proved: 1st. By the nature of those problems with which any theology, whether rational or revealed, must deal, but which mere reason itself cannot solve; such as the character, constitution, and policy of the Creator; the origin and object of the creation; and the relations and destiny of the creature. 2d. By the history of rational religion, which abounds in idol and mythical deities, in fabulous cosmogonies, and in the crudest notions of futurity. 3d. By the history of rational philosophy, which, whenever it has cast off the guidance of revelation, has groped into the darkness of atheism, pantheism, fatalism. scepticism, and nihilism.

In the third place there is in human reason a capacity for such a divine revelation. All rational theology craves a revealed theology, as its legitimate sequel and complement. This may be proved: 1st. By the adaptation of the finite mind to an Infinite mind, and its susceptibility to education through an objective revelation distinct from that made in nature and providence. 2d. By the universal reminiscence or presentiment of a revelation, which is expressed in all heathenism; and, 3d. By the germs or rudiments of such a revelation, in which all rational philosophy and natural religion abound.

In the fourth place, that divine revelation which has been given meets both the necessity and the capacity of human reason. This may be shown: 1st. From its form, which, having been progressive, scriptural, and miraculous, is suited to the rational constitution of mankind. 2d. From its contents, which not only elucidate and confirm whatsoever is sound in rational religion, but, in consistency therewith, contribute a complementary system of doctrine bringing a peculiar self-evidence of its own; and, 3d. From its effects, which have ever been to correct, stimulate, and mature all rational philosophy.

In a word, we may conclude that there can be no truly rational theology without a revealed theology as its counter-

part and supplement. Until God makes Himself known to us by some objective revelation, in some apocalypse more direct and personal than His mere creation and providence, our knowledge of Him must remain partial and erroneous; while the actual addition to that knowledge by means of such divine communication has ever only had the effect of imparting to it greater unity, precision, and completeness. The Jehovah of Holy Scripture is in fact that sole Reality whereof all mythical and ideal deities are but harbingers and witnesses. As in Him the unknown God of heathenism is made known, and need no longer be ignorantly worshipped, so also in Him may the highest abstractions of philosophy, the Infinite, the Absolute, the First Cause, find rational support and consistency, and become objects of adoration no less than of science.

Such is the act of the Infinite Mind in its recognition of the finite mind, an act of revelation; but if we now inquire what must be the correspondent act of the finite mind in its recognition of the Infinite Mind thus revealed, or how the two are related on the ground of such mutual intelligence and intercommunication, we broach the next and last of the subjects to be considered.

Our fifth problem relates to the demonstrability of the Absolute. Can it be proved to be what it is revealed to be? May the God of Scripture be identified with the God of reason or of nature? or are the two irreconcilable? Must our revealed knowledge ever remain singular and separate? or may it be logically combined with our rational knowledge? Are the evidences of revelation only, or are also its contents, a proper subject of inquiry?

In reference to this question, a remarkable attempt has lately been made to unite science and religion upon a common ground of pure antilogy. The Hamiltonian divines, under the leadership of Mansel, maintain that both the revealed Jehovah and the rational Absolute, when logically investigated, are found to be equally self-contradictory, and, in fact, that the Reality which they suggest and prefigure can neither be revealed nor demonstrated, but can only be represented and believed. It is even argued by this thinker that the main

function of reason is to demonstrate the Godhead to be undemonstrable, and the only effect of revelation is to reveal it to be unrevealable. The so-called anthropomorphism and anthropopathy of Scripture are accepted as not peculiar to Christianity, but inherent in the very constitution of the human mind; and the doctrines of the trinity, the incarnation, and the atonement, if viewed as matter of faith, are held as sufficiently accurate to guide our worship and practice, but if viewed as matter of science, are no better than a sort of didactic representation, or divine epic, wherein the Father, Son, and Spirit appear as *dramatis personæ*, and perform the tragedy of Calvary on the scene of human history.

Of this refined dogmatism, what can we say, but that, like the covert rationalism before noticed, it jeopards the interest it would protect, and is only the more pernicious because of its pious intent. For if reason and revelation combined can yield us no real knowledge of God, or if it is the office of the latter to practice illusions which it is the office of the former to expose, in what respect are we better than the heathen or the sceptic? How much would there be to choose between such a dramatic Jehovah and the mythical Jupiter? Why not accept both as mere phases of a popular theology, which the learned are to outgrow and gracefully patronize? It is this specious effort to exalt reason by dragging revelation to its level, which has already in many an orthodox communion, led to a mere show of wisdom in will-worship and humility, and as it extends among the people, can have no other effect than to corrupt their minds from the simplicity that is in Christ.

And hence we regard as by far the most consistent dogmatists, those who frankly admit their hostility to rational research, and intrepidly press their biblical creed in the face of all human science. We are only amused now at the sturdy dogmatism which once repudiated, on Scripture grounds, the rotundity and motion of the earth; but it was at least honest and consistent, and drew the lines sharply between orthodoxy and heterodoxy. That were but a sorry championship of Christianity which would desperately end the battle with infidelity by springing a mine of common

absurdity under both combatants. But let the question simply be, whether the rational Absolute and the revealed Jehovah are reconcilable or irreconcilable, and then we can proceed intelligently.

And, in the first place, that the Absolute may be demonstrated, we maintain on the ground that it has been revealed. If it had been actually concealed from us, it could not, of course, be rationally investigated; but having been intelligibly disclosed to us, it may be brought within the purview of reason, to be either accepted or rejected, proved or disproved, held in opposition to other truths and facts or established in consistency therewith.

In the second place, there is in divine revelation a necessity for such a human demonstration. We do not mean that reason is either prior or superior to revelation, but simply that, although inferior and supplementary, it is nevertheless indispensable. This will appear: 1st. From the origin of revelation as a direct emanation from the infinite reason of God; 2d. From the aim of revelation as a direct communication to the finite reason of man; 3d. From the purport of this communication as conveying new truth, which must, sooner or later, in greater or less degree, be found rationally consistent with the old.

In the third place, there is in divine revelation a fitness for such human demonstration. On examination it is found to be susceptible of rational investigation and vindication. This appears: 1st. From its actual evidences, which, unlike those of false revelations, satisfy the demands of reason; 2d. From its actual contents, which present problems upon which reason cannot but be exercised; 3d. From its actual structure. which, as a mere fragmentary composition of facts, truths, and principles, devolves upon reason the task of their logical organization into a system.

In the fourth place, such a human demonstration is already in progress. The reconciliation of revealed and rational knowledge is now going forward, wherever the two are thrown into combination. It may be discerned: 1st. In all apologetic, exegetical, and systematic theology, which are respectively but so many attempts to demonstrate the evidences,

import, and harmony of revelation; 2d. In all rational theology, which, whenever pursued independently, though reverently, has but served to develop and elucidate problems propounded by revelation; 3d. In all the other rational sciences, which, whether physical or metaphysical, by their own normal procession in human history, are but logically unfolding the attributes of the revealed Jehovah, and demonstrating Him to be the only rational Absolute.

In a word, we may conclude that as there can be no rational theology without a revealed theology, so there can be no revealed theology without a rational theology. The two complement and support each other, and are both normally and ultimately coincident. They, in fact, present the same Reality; the one under a theoretical, and the other under a practical aspect; the one as an object of science, and the other as a subject of revelation; and neither could be disjoined without detriment to both. If, on the one hand, the rational Absolute can only be found in the revealed Jehovah, yet, on the other hand, the revealed Jehovah can only be demonstrated by means of the rational Absolute. Destroy reason, and there can be no revealed theology; destroy revelation, and there can be no rational theology; retain both as logically irreconcilable, and we must choose which theology to maintain against the other; but retain both as logically reconcilable, and then both theologies become like intersecting spheres, which cannot but ultimately coincide, or like opposite members of an arc, which must meet in a common support or mingle in a common union.

And the respective systems of science which are founded upon the two theologies must, likewise, stand or fall together. If, on the one hand, our physics and ethics are demonstrating the divine attributes, both natural and moral; yet, on the other hand, those divine attributes afford the only scientific basis of our physics and ethics. Moreover, while the rational division of the sciences, both physical and psychical, thus logically requires the support of the revealed theology; yet, at the same time, the revealed division of the same series of sciences as logically requires the support of a rational theology. The two branch divisions are not less the counter-

part of each other than are the two radical factors of reason and revelation whence they have proceeded. Nor are they less vitally connected in their practical issues. Detached from the revealed Jehovah, the rational sciences, as they theoretically involve atheism or pantheism, must tend to irreligion or idolatry; detached from the rational Absolute, the revealed sciences, as they theoretically involve dogmatism and bigotry, must tend to superstition and barbarism; but let the two be united and pursued together, and neither can fly into an extreme. We then have, in the ideal or ultimate reconciliation of rational with revealed science, the ideal or ultimate reconciliation of Christianity with civilization. Philosophy is married to religion, art to worship, and earth to heaven.

Thus what we have been taught respecting God in Scripture by our creed, we find proved in nature by our science. And whether we say, in philosophical phrase, that the Infinite Will (*causa causarum*) proceeds logically towards the Infinite Reason (*ratio rationum*) through those successive mechanical, chemical, organical, ethical, political, and religious forces in which it is rationally exerted through immensity and eternity; or whether we say, in theological phrase, that the "Spirit, infinite, eternal, and unchangeable in His being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness, and truth," hath decreed, "according to the council of His will, for His own glory, whatsoever comes to pass;" or whether we say, in Scripture phrase, that Jehovah is "the Alpha and the Omega, the First and the Last, the beginning and the end, which was, and which is, and which is to come, the Almighty;" in either case, we are but apprehending the same intelligible and adorable Reality.

Let heathen philosophy proclaim the Godhead unknown, and inscribe upon its fanes the fitting motto of such a deity:

> "I am all that was, and is, and shall be;
> Nor my veil, has it been withdrawn by mortal;"

but for the Christian philosopher to avow that "the last and highest consecration of all true religion must be an altar,—'To the unknown and unknowable God,'" is to forget that the times of such ignorance are now passed, that the veil of Isis has been rent, for all that will reverently gaze, and that only

by ever knowing the ever knowable God do we have life eternal.

We have thus reached, as our general conclusion, a modified affirmative to the whole series of questions propounded. As we passed from one to the other, we have striven for a firm foothold at each step by carefully avoiding the quagmire on either side. Considering the Absolute as an object of thought, we have admitted that our conception of it must be partial, while we have maintained that it may at least be consistent. Considering it as an object of faith, we have admitted that our belief in it is instinctive, while we have maintained that it involves no latent absurdity. Considering it as an object of knowledge, we have admitted that our cognition of it is imperfect, while we have maintained that it is nevertheless certain. Considering it as a reality to be revealed, we have admitted that a rational theology is posssible, while we have maintained that a revealed theology is its indispensable complement. Considering it as a reality to be demonstrated, we have admitted that the revealed theology is necessary, while we have maintained that a rational theology is its indispensable supplement. And by means of such distinctions we have escaped the corresponding extremes of atheism and pantheism, scepticism and mysticism, nescience and omniscience, naturalism and paganism, rationalism and dogmatism; at the same time that we have combined into one connected argument the several truths thus sifted from each discussion. Were such an arrangement and treatment of these difficult questions more generally observed, we cannot but think that much of the controversy now waged about them would disappear.

As a fit practical conclusion of the whole argument, we may now notice the absolute need of a divine, super-rational revelation for the guidance and completion of philosophy. Apart from the momentous moral uses of such a revelation, (of which we do not here speak), if we consider it merely in an intellectual light, we must claim it to be indispensable to the formation of a theory and system of perfect knowledge. The experiment of doing without it has been tried on the largest possible scale. We have found different thinkers, of

different schools, in different nations, contributing to a movement which has grown and spread for half a century, until now it involves the most vital interests of humanity. At its origin, like a mountain rivulet which a pebble might so divide that it shall afterwards flood opposite valleys, the question presented seems almost too simple and harmless for grave discussion: Shall the Absolute be held as a subjective idea or as an objective reality? Idealistic Germany has pursued the former; realistic England has pursued the latter; while versatile France has seemed to vibrate from the one to the other. And now what is the result before us? The two philosophical tendencies, thus starting in opposite directions, have reached their utmost limits only to disclose a vast intellectual void between them, which, if filled at all, must be filled by a divine revelation.

At the one extreme, we behold a Positivism which would simply extinguish philosophy in sheer nescience. It would not only contract the scope of philosophy, but make its very aim fatuitous. As begun by Hobbes, Hume and Comte, it quietly ignored all the metaphysical sciences. As pursued by Spencer, Lewes, and Fiske, it has combined the remaining empirical sciences in a sort of hypothetical cosmology, held together by a supposed law of universal evolution. And then, instead of supporting such a cosmic theory with that revealed theology which alone might give it any rational coherence, it builds it over a magazine of logical contradictions, into which philosophy can carry her torch only to explode all science in ultimate ignorance and all religion in conscious illusion.

At the other extreme, we behold an Absolutism which would merely evaporate philosophy in a fancied omniscience. Besides expanding her sphere beyond the reach of finite mind, it would then vainly claim an immediate, infinite knowledge. As heralded by Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel, it sought to logically unfold all the sciences, both empirical and metaphysical, out of the potential notion of the Absolute. As completed by Feuerbach, Schopenhauer, and Hartmann, it has sublimated the whole intelligible universe, including nature, man and god, into a mere human conception or ideal repre-

sentation. And then in this imaginary world of its own creation, where it has thus superseded the Creator in His office and usurped the function of a revelation, it leaves to philosophy the task of resolving all science into a mere dazzling paradox, and all religion into a terrible mockery.

CHAPTER IV.

THE FINAL PHILOSOPHY OR THEORY OF PERFECTIBLE SCIENCE.

We have seen that neither the Positive Philosophy nor the Absolute Philosophy can furnish an exhaustive theory and system of knowledge, divine and human; the former, because it would ignore that whole metaphysical region which is largely occupied by revelation; and the latter, because it would supersede revelation throughout that region. And now it remains to inquire whether there be not some future and final philosophy, wherein reason shall appear concurrent with revelation, and human science be rendered harmonious with Divine Omniscience.

"Not to despair of philosophy," said Sir William Hamilton, "is a last infirmity of noble minds." And never did a noble mind succeed better in conquering it. No philosopher in modern times has striven so hard to set bounds to the cognitive instinct, or brought to the task such transcendent powers. Other thinkers may have had their moments of scepticism or misgiving as to the attainment of absolute truth, and some may even have abandoned the pursuit as hopeless; but what was in him, from the first, a constitutional tendency had become also a philosophical theory, and at length a religious creed. The discipline which he inculcated was that of a "prudent nescience;" his goal for the whole intellectual career would have been a "learned ignorance;" and over the very portal of revelation he wrote, as a flaming menace, the inscription, "To the unknown God." Even from philosophy her-

self he sought to wring stultifying "testimonies," displaying the chance confessions of her disciples, in learned array, as but so many fagots for her funeral pyre. If nothing is left her but to die, it must be confessed that in these charming disquisitions she can find what Coleridge terms her "euthanasy and apotheosis."

We do not forget the noble services of the great Edinburgh philosopher at the juncture when he appeared. No one now thinks of denying that the "Philosophy of the Conditioned," viewed as a check upon the "Philosophy of the Absolute," has had, and is still having, a most wholesome influence. It was the protest of robust, Scottish common sense against the vagaries of German transcendentalism, and the dazzling generalizations of French eclecticism. Appearing at a time when philosophy seemed in a fair way to degenerate into mere speculative cosmogony, it served to dissipate the brilliant world-bubbles with which grave thinkers were amusing themselves, and has already restored a more healthy and masculine tone to all modern thinking. The result is, that the philosopher no longer seeks, spider-like, to spin the whole phenomenal universe as a mere gossamer of abstractions out of his own subjectivity, mistaking the flimsy logic of man for the essential process of nature; but is content to explore cautiously the region of facts and principles, recognizing, at every step, the limitations, as well as the capacities of his own mental constitution. To have thus checked the speculative prosperity in the midst of a wide-spreading hallucination, and brought it back to the paths of reason and common sense, is a service which cannot be too gratefully felt, and will place the name of Hamilton among the brightest in the annals of philosophy.

Nor will we, in the least, undervalue the polemical uses of his logic against false philosophy, by insisting upon its entire want of positive fruit and constructive power, when it is remembered that he did not himself pretend to build up anything in place of the systems which he had destroyed, but rather strove to demonstrate that we have neither foundation nor material for absolute science or knowledge of things as they are, and that all efforts after such knowledge must, in the

nature of the case, be abortive. It is in fact not so much with the master as with his disciples that we join issue. We believe them to have made a use of his doctrine of nescience which, however naturally it may have followed, he did not foresee, and could not have approved. What was perhaps meant to serve as mere logical discipline and safe-guard, has been hastily applied by one party to questions of religion, and by another to questions of science, in a manner suited to bring them both into contempt. As a consequence, we behold at the feet of the same teacher a school of Christian apologists resolving the material of faith into sheer contradiction, and a school of sceptical scientists resolving the material of knowledge into mere ignorance. Scarcely has Mr. Mansel, from the extreme right brought forward his theory of a regulative revelation which shall accommodate the truth to our faculties, when Mr. Spencer, from the extreme left, rejoins with a homily on the "transcendent impiety which claims to penetrate the secrets of the Power manifested to us through all existence—nay, even to stand behind that Power, and note the conditions to its action." Thus the very cant of divines is becoming the creed of thinkers, at the same time that the speculations of thinkers are made the dogmas of divines; and we are ready to fancy ourselves looking at a sort of philosophical masquerade, in which orthodoxy itself strives to be wise above that which is written, while even infidelity affects to be meek and lowly.

There is of course somewhat of good as well as evil in these extraordinary interactions. They illustrate that beneficent law of progress, by which extremists are sometimes driven to exchange positions before they settle into a just agreement; and we cite them, not merely in proof that the mission of the Hamiltonian metaphysics is drawing to a close, but also as signs of a better day which we may hope it is heralding. Everything, indeed, in the present state of philosophy, betokens a crisis already passed, a reaction at hand, and a commencing return to the normal use of reason. The genius of modern research, after a long course of speculation, in which it has been hurried to the wildest extremes, by turns accepting and rejecting the most opposite premises,

now denying what it would be next to madness to doubt, anon admitting what it would be almost idiocy to believe, seems at length to have run the entire round of theories, and exhausted the utmost capacity of thought; and that very apathy which its excesses have engendered, amounting in some minds to a cynical unbelief, and tinging at times the most serious themes with satire, may prove to be but the wholesome disgust with which it is going back to the ways of simplicity and truth. One might almost liken its present posture to that of heathen philosophy at the dawn of Christianity, when, after having pursued from dire necessity, rather than perverse choice, the same fruitless career, it sat among decaying superstitions and errors, as in the melancholy twilight yearning for the day-spring.

We may accord to Hamilton the merit of this great reaction; but we surely cannot abide in the mere reaction itself as a finality. His theory of absolute ignorance, salutary as it has proved for a time, appears to us as little likely to exhaust the function of philosophy as to bring about a peace among philosophers themselves. While we may join him in repudiating the vain dogma of an immediate omniscience, we must still question if the only alternative be that of simple nescience. It would seem to be as irrational to assume that man can know nothing as to presume that he can know everything. The Conditionist, too, has proved himself to be quite as one-sided and reckless a thinker as the much-abused Absolutist. And now that the antagonists, as in the trite fable of the two knights, under the impulses of controversy have been forced to exchange views of the same twofold reality, it only remains that both should lose sight of their several errors in the recognition of their common truths.

Such a candid comparison of the two great phases of modern thought has, indeed, come to be the first duty of the philosopher. And it is fortunate that his task is at length so simple and obvious. A little reflection will show that but one course is now open to the speculative mind. It would be folly to reject either of its present tendencies, merely because of their extreme development, and it would be impossible to hold to both in their existing antagonism. Accepting each

as alike with the other legitimate and irrepressible, we must find for them, in their rebound, some middle region of belief or theory which they can hold in common, and some healthy interaction by means of which their dissolving contrasts shall vanish in the unity of truth, the harmony of knowledge, and the perfection of reason. In other words, the problem which is now to be met is that of a logical conciliation of the Absolute Philosophy and the Positive Philosophy, in some one final philosophy which shall be their sequel and complement.

And to this great problem the foremost thinkers of the age would seem to be already addressing themselves; more or less consciously it may be, but not without hopefulness. The very exigency out of which it arises has brought with it a spirit favorable to the inquiry. That failure of the speculative faculty, in any single direction to find for itself a complete theory of knowledge, while it may have driven some minds into scepticism, and others into mysticism, has but served in the more moderate class, to foster those philosophic virtues of caution, humility, patience, candor, and catholicity, which are most needed in a work of conciliation and reconstruction, and now only wait to be led into action. At least we very much mistake the tone of some later speculations if this is not a common and growing feeling; and it is in the hope of expressing it that we propose to state the question which we have represented as emerging, and to indicate, as far as may be, the probable course of philosophical opinion respecting it.

As illustrations of the present speculative crisis, we need only mention the rising German school of ideal-realists, such as Trendelenburg, Ulrici, Zeller, and Weis, who seek from various standpoints to correlate thoughts with things, the process of logic with the course of nature, physics with metaphysics, and empirical with rational science. Another class of thinkers, such as Flügel, Tobias, Stöckl, Steudel, Wekerle, is discussing the true function, scope, and problems of the philosophy of the future. Professor David Masson, in his "Recent British Philosophy," has also reached the conclusion that the chief philosophic question now is between empiricism and transcendentalism, agnosticism and gnosticism, nihilism and absolutism.

It is often said that there are, as there could be, and have been, but two distinct aims or tendencies of the philosophic mind. Old as the rival schools of Plato and Aristotle, we behold them reappearing with extraordinary vigor in modern Europe; the one mainly pursued by a line of German thinkers, extending from Kant to Hegel, and the other by a line of English thinkers, extending from Bacon to Hamilton; while, by the constructive genius of the French, they have been respectively systematized in the Absolutism of Cousin, and the Positivism of Comte. We assign such positions to the two last-named thinkers, because they are in fact the most consistent and consequent representatives of the schools to which they severally belong. Cousin was proud to acknowledge himself a pupil of Hegel, and, better than any other philosopher out of Germany, succeeded in mastering the doctrine of the Absolute, and bringing it to completeness; and although Comte was indeed a stranger to Hamilton in everything but his premises, and differed from him in all other respects as widely as one philosopher could differ from another, yet there is no other writer, either in or out of England, who has so vigorously carried out the doctrine of the conditioned in the domain of science, or so completely filled up the hiatus which it leaves in that of religion; neither Mr. Spencer, with his reverence for the Unknowable, nor Mr. Mansel, with his anthropomorphic revelation, being half so philosophical as the founder of the new "Religion of Humanity," who at least knew what he professed to worship, while they profess to worship they know not what.

We need hardly say that in thus classing together different thinkers as absolutists or positivists, we mean only to impute to them what they held in common, even though it may have been without concert, and to find for ourselves terms to indicate the two great parties into which the philosophical world has become divided in respect to the validity and extent of our knowledge, which is the great paramount problem to be considered. However much such writers as Fichte, Schelling, Hegel, Cousin, Ferrier, and Calderwood, may disagree upon minor questions, yet they are all easily recognized as advocates of that solution of the problem known as the Philoso-

phy of the Absolute; in the same manner that Hamilton, Mansel, Spencer, Lewes, Stuart Mill, and Comte, though but ill assorted in many respects, must be ranked together as defenders of an opposite solution of it, termed the Positive Philosophy or the Philosophy of the Conditioned.

It is to be regretted, indeed, that better terms cannot be found for expressing such important distinctions; but the wide currency which these have obtained, the recognized sense which is attached to them, and the difficulty, at the present stage of inquiry, of inventing others, more precise and yet as comprehensive, seem to leave us no alternative but to use them with such explanations as may serve to fix and guard their meaning.

The terms Idealism and Realism are also in general use, but they are hardly precise enough for the present purpose; while Empiricism and Transcendentalism, though sufficiently precise, are wanting in comprehensiveness, as both of them refer obviously to the mere process of knowledge rather than to its content or measure. But Positivism and Absolutism, besides being free from that somewhat opprobrious sense which the other terms have acquired as popular epithets, will respectively express the ideal and the real departments of knowledge, at the same time that they characterize the two great systems of knowledge with which we are familiar as the extreme results of the empirical and transcendental methods.

Let it then be premised that the words "Absolute" and "Positive" will here be employed only in their strictest etymological sense and most philosophical application, as correlate adjectives; the former meaning that which is absolved or loosed from any necessary relation; what it is as existing by itself, in its own interior essence, disconnected from our minds and neither conditioned nor modified by our cognitive faculties; and the latter meaning that which is posited or fixed in some contingent relation; what it appears as manifested to us, under its phenomenal character, in connection with our minds, and either conditioned or modified by our cognitive faculties. According to these definitions, it will be found that that which is positive must also be finite, embracing only manifested existence; while that which is absolute may also

be Infinite, embracing all real existence, and also, that both taken together, in a religious sense, will imply each other as the co-existing creation and Creator. The two ideas, however, will come out more clearly as we now proceed to define the two philosophies which are founded upon them.

The Positivist may in general be said to deal with things only as they positively appear; with facts and the laws of facts; or as it is more technically expressed, with the uniformities of succession and coëxistence among phenomena. These he takes to be the sole material of exact knowledge, and restricts the philosopher to the task of investigating and classifying them. The method he pursues is *a posteriori*, empirical, that of induction, or the ascent from particulars to generals, from facts to principles; the faculty on which he relies is the sensuous understanding; and the outward means which he employs are such as observation, comparison, and experiment. He is in his temperament practical, logical, and exact; a man of facts, who scoffs at ideas as but the mere chaff of things, and is not to be reasoned out of his senses.

The Absolutist may in general be said to deal with things as they absolutely are; with realities and causes; or with what are technically termed substances, essences, noumena, occult powers and principles. These he holds to be the only objects of real knowledge, and calls upon the philosopher to boldly seize them, and thence unfold the sum of truth. The method which he pursues is *a priori*, transcendental, that of deduction, or the descent from generals to particulars, from principles to facts; the faculty upon which he relies is the pure reason; and the inward processes to which he yields himself are those of insight, conjecture, and speculation. He is in his habit of mind contemplative, abstract and theoretical; a man of ideas, who eschews facts as but the mere husks of truth, and is not to be hoodwinked by his senses.

We are ready now to distinguish the two antagonistic philosophies, or philosophical tendencies, from each other.

As opposed to the Absolutist, the Positivist holds a doctrine of human nescience. Howsoever it may be with God or other beings, man, he maintains, is so limited by his cognitive faculties that he neither knows, nor can know, aught of things as

they absolutely are in themselves, but only as they appear to him, or are represented to him in the modifying process of his own intelligence. Conversant with these mere appearances or phenomena, he must utterly ignore their accompanying noumena or substances as realities which he may indeed believe, but can no more conceive than the blind can fancy colors or the deaf imagine sounds, and which in fact, for anything he knows, as they appear to the inhabitants of Saturn and Jupiter, would be to him as inconceivable as colors of sounds, or sounds of colors. And to this deficiency in the mode of our knowledge, he would add a necessary limitation as to its extent. Finite minds cannot hope to take in the boundless unknown, under all its manifold aspects. As related to man, the universe of which he forms a part, is like a polygon with but one of its infinitesimal sides adjusted to his capacity, and every attempt to embrace, even in thought, the Infinite and Absolute Reality can only recoil upon him in mere negation and contradiction. That philosopher, in fact, who dreams of actually transcending the finite understanding and soaring to some extra-human height of speculation, whence he may survey all existence in its essences, origins, and tendencies, is simply out of his senses. Is it not, therefore, the better part of wisdom and common sense to take the world as we find it, without seeking to vainly revise or comprehend it?

As opposed to the Positivist, the Absolutist holds a doctrine of human omniscience. Real knowledge, he insists, must be the same in man as in God and all cognitive beings, and so far from being restricted to mere phenomena, it may, and often does, involve an apprehension of things as in reality the very opposite of their appearance. We know, for example, in spite of the misrepresentations of our senses, that the earth moves around the sun, and though both sun and earth should appear to the inhabitants of Saturn or Jupiter to be moving around them, yet their science or actual knowledge of the facts could not possibly differ in kind from ours, or even from Omniscience itself. Nor is it necessary, in his view, to set any bounds to such knowledge. Finite as man may be, he is nevertheless the microcosm which reflects the whole macro-

cosm of the universe, as the dewdrop reflects the cope of heaven, and may embrace the Infinite and Absolute Reality in his very consciousness, or seize it in one swift intuition of his intellect, or unerringly recapitulate it in his logic. That philosopher, indeed, who forfeits these godlike powers of vision and apprehension, to burrow after his five senses among a few facts, has but fallen from his humanity, and lost his reason. Is it not therefore the nobler part of the creature to enter into the wisdom of the Creator, and find out that ideal of the creation which is becoming actual?

Let us next trace the two philosophies to their final results, in the more practical spheres where they issue.

On the one side, the extreme Positivist becomes at length a sceptic in religion as well as in science. Having ignored the Absolute, or resolved it into contradictions, he cannot long retain as credible that which he has proved to be both incognizable and inconceivable; he cannot believe in that which he can neither think nor know. He is therefore left without God in the world. And the universe remains to him but as a museum of dry facts; life is but a struggle against death; and nature is but the splendid tomb of man. Or if he recoil from this gulf of atheism, it is only to frame for himself, out of the remaining social phenomena with which he has to deal, a kind of scientific religion, with Humanity for his God, savants for his priests, industry for his worship, fame for his immortality, and a civilized earth as his heaven.

On the other side, the extreme absolutist becomes at length a mystic in science as well as in religion. Having transcended all positive phenomena, or absorbed them in the process of reason, he claims that to be fully comprehensible which he has proved to be conceivable; he believes he can know whatsoever he can think. Both the world therefore and God are lost in himself; and the universe becomes to him but as a passing vision of phænomena; time but as a mere shadow of eternity; and man but as a gilded bubble on the stream of nature. And not dizzied at this height of pantheism, he even dreams of a kind of intuitive omniscience, by which both experience and revelation are to be superseded, facts resolved into ideas, creation reduced to logic,

and the whole dissolving universe reviewed from its genesis to its apocalypse.

The eye may now assist the mind, if we view the opposite terms of the two philosophies in parallel columns. They will exhibit their contrasts under several heads:

(1.) AS TO THE MATERIAL OF KNOWLEDGE.

Appearances	*versus*	Realities.
Phænomena	"	Noumena.
Qualities	"	Essences.
Accidents	"	Substances.
The Contingent	"	The Necessary.
The Particular	"	The Universal.
The Finite	"	The Infinite.
The Conditioned	"	The Unconditioned.

(2.) AS TO THE PROCESS OF KNOWLEDGE.

The Understanding	*versus*	The Reason.
Sensation	"	Reflection.
Observation	"	Intuition.
Experiment	"	Conjecture.
Induction	"	Deduction.
Analysis	"	Synthesis.
Common Sense	"	Genius.
Discovery	"	Revelation.

(3.) AS TO THE SYSTEM OF KNOWLEDGE.

Realism	*versus*	Idealism.
Scepticism	"	Mysticism.
Empiricism	"	Transcendentalism.
Materialism	"	Spiritualism.
Atheism	"	Pantheism.
Agnosticism	"	Gnosticism.

Other terms, of like import, might be added to each class, but these will suffice as familiar specimens. To sum up the results of the whole comparison in a few words: The absolutist, trusting solely to his reason, would penetrate behind or beyond phænomena in search of their essence or cause, and endeavor by mere logical process from assumed principles to revise and reconstruct the existing universe; while the positivist, trusting solely to his senses, would abandon realities for their appearances or phænomena, and endeavor by mere empirical process from admitted facts to investigate and modify the existing universe. And while the former would erect the sciences into a system of philosophic omnis-

cience, and so abruptly consummate the task of philosophy; the other would as abruptly leave it incomplete, by erecting them into a system of philosophic nescience. Thus the pyramid might serve as a symbol of the one and the obelisk of the other. And if (adopting Sir W. Hamilton's quotations) to the one we might apply the maxim of Abelard, "Intellige, ut credas" (Know, that you may believe), to the other might be applied that of Anselm, "Crede, ut intelligas" (Believe, that you may know).

Such are the two philosophies to be reconciled. And we ask, if to merely state them with any fairness is not to find them already somewhat accordant? Why should we be in haste to reject one more than the other, or to maintain one against the other? Who would be so bold as to ignore either category of cognizable material; phænomena or noumena? or so rash as to obliterate either class of cognitive faculties; the empirical or the rational? or so vain as to dream of swallowing up the cognitive capacity, either in infinite knowledge or absolute ignorance? Which of the two philosophies alone, without the other, could develop our whole power of knowing, or exhaust the entire sum of the knowable? May they not both be essential to the completion of philosophy? And must we not begin to look for the grounds and means of their conciliation?

Our first argument for this view is, that both philosophies are deeply rooted in the human mind and have grown and spread for centuries in history, until now they have become interwoven with the most precious interests of civilization.

There is no sound mental constitution in which the germs of both are not to be found, or from which they can be wholly extirpated. In every community of scholars, in every circle of thinkers, their respective representatives will appear. Every man may be said to be characterized by one or the other. Some are such intense positivists, they will confine themselves to the few facts within reach of their senses, pronouncing all beyond these a region of pure faith or mere conjecture; some are such thorough absolutists, they will almost question facts themselves until they have gone behind them in search of their causes and reasons; still others

would seem to be absolutists as to one set of facts and positivists as to another, or absolutists and positivists by turns as to the same facts, according to their prejudices or circumstances. The sceptic in religion will be a mystic in science and become the dupe of any vulgar imposture; or the mystic in religion will be a sceptic in science and dogmatize against mathematical certainty itself; or the most exact scientist, alike with the most devout religionist, will be found culling texts or facts to suit some wild hypothesis. But he who is wholly without one or the other of these philosophical elements, or possessing one denies or suppresses the other, can only serve as an example of an undeveloped or abnormal intellect.

And what is thus patent in the very constitution of the human intellect has been conspicuous throughout history. Everywhere, and in all ages, these two original tendencies have appeared, acting and reacting upon each other, and by turns predominating in the whole existing civilization. If we go back to the primitive world, we shall behold them upon a grand scale, diverging eastward and westward on opposite sides of the globe, until they have reached their extreme development as literal antipodes of thought, in that Asiatic absolutism which would lose the finite in the infinite as but a dream of Brahm; and that European positivism which would lose the infinite in the finite under a portion of consecrated bread. Or, if we view them upon a smaller scale, as developed in that part of the world with which we are most familiar, we have but to think of such representative names as Plato and Aristotle in Greek philosophy, Anselm and Abelard in scholastic philosophy, Bacon and Descartes in modern philosophy, and Hegel and Comte in existing philosophy, in order to see that he must simply strike out one page of history, who would ignore either of the two tendencies.

It is true that attempts have been made to write the history of philosophy, in the interest of one to the exclusion of the other, or at least to press the evidence of one in a partisan spirit, against that of the other. The "Philosophical Testimonies," adduced by Hamilton, bear marks of that erudition for

which he was so distinguished, and yet, regarded as a strict historic induction, they are open to at least three serious objections: 1st. They consist mainly of a mere crude aggregate of names, authorities, maxims, extracts, culled with a foregone purpose, and without anything in the nature of an exhaustive survey of all the intellectual phænomena of the periods to which they severally belong. 2d. Many of them, especially those pertaining to the scholastic age, are simply religious confessions of the weakness and depravity of the carnal understanding, rather than philosophical definitions of the normal limits and capacities of the intellect. 3d. Such of them as are strictly philosophical can easily be balanced if not outweighed, by numerous and powerful testimonies to the opposite doctrine. Place in the scale with this treatise the equally learned and sagacious work of Cousin on the History of Philosophy, and it will be seen, that History refuses to commit herself to one tendency more than the other, but claims both as alike ineradicable and universal.

And as a consequence of their deep roots and long growth in the past life of the race, they have sent forth and interwoven their branches through all modern society. In their wake have followed portentous systems of science, politics, and religion, which as simple monuments of speculative energy are suited to fill the mind with wonder, while in their practical bearings upon the most vital interests, they are already formidable for good as well as for evil.

This is certainly true of the supreme interest of religion. It were idle to maintain, that either of the two philosophical tendencies is essentially depraved or depraving, when we behold them flowing along together, where the stream of history is most open and pure, in the very channels of the Church, and under the full blaze of the Christian revelation. From the first chapter of the Gospel of St. John to the last chapter of the most recent theological treatise, Christianity has in fact been striving after a philosophical statement and vindication of her peculiar facts and truths, through the formulas of one or the other of these two rival schools of speculation. The inevitable task of adjusting the human intellect to the divine intellect, and accounting to reason for

the content of revelation, has involved the one as much as the other. And we have only to survey the present state of religious parties with regard to them to see how impossible it would be to draw the lines between them, so as to drive either beyond the pale of orthodoxy. If the Hegelian absolutism, at one extreme, became evaporated into a mere Christian mythology, yet at the other extreme, it aspired after nothing less than a true Christian theology; and although the Hamiltonian positivism, as we have seen, has been driven on the one side toward the abyss of a scientific atheism, yet on the other, it has been hailed as a new bulwark of the most orthodox faith. Extravagant as such opposite results may appear, yet there is too much truth as well as error involved in these systems, for the Christian divine to think of either despising or disparaging them, and he who idly strikes a blow at them has need to beware lest he be found aiming at the vitals of Christianity itself.

And the same is not less true of the great interest of science. If we are tempted to regard the two philosophical tendencies as mere speculative efforts, recurring from age to age without aim or issue, we have only to trace their historical connection with the various bodies of real knowledge, which they have respectively nourished, and which they still involve, after centuries of growth, in a state of intellectual schism and anarchy. And it is only when either has been exclusively followed that it has run into flagrant error. If the positivism represented by Bacon has been driven by Comte to the extreme of the baldest materialism in the domain of metaphysics, yet has not the absolutism, initiated by Descartes, been carried by Schelling to the sheerest mysticism in the domain of physics? Leaving out of view such mere vagaries of the two procedures, and surveying only their positive contents or results, the empirical or physical sciences issuing from the one, and the rational or metaphysical sciences issuing from the other, it will be seen that to ignore either of them would be to paralyze an entire half of the body of knowledge, as well as to imperil some of the most catholic and lasting interests of humanity itself.

But we are now ready for our next argument, which is, that

the two philosophies, if logically adjusted and combined, would so check and complete each other, as to yield the one final philosophy of the future. And this, whatever view we take of the mission of philosophy, whether it concern the method, or the theory, or the system of perfect knowledge.

Is it primarily her mission to prescribe a method of perfect knowledge, to train the cognitive faculty to precise action, and equip the social intellect with all possible means and modes of research? Then it is not in either of the antagonistic methods, now separately pursued, that such symmetrical discipline can be found. Both are alike needed as mutual correctives and, so long as followed apart, must become erroneous and pernicious. As a sound absolutism will be the only cure for the materialism, scepticism, and atheism of the extreme positivist, so a sound positivism will be the only cure for the idealism, mysticism, and pantheism of the extreme absolutist. Let the deductive process of the one be pressed in ignorance of the laws of facts, and our science cannot but be vague and visionary; let the inductive process of the other be pressed in ignorance of the causes of facts, and our science cannot but be partial and schismatic; but let both processes be conjoined as complementary factors of knowledge; the deductive with the inductive, the rational with the empirical, intuition with experience, conjecture with observation, revelation with discovery, and then we may hope for that *Ultimatum Organum*, or last unerring logic, by which philosophy is to mount toward perfect knowledge.

But is it furthermore her mission to provide a theory of such perfect knowledge, to discern the grounds, limits, and goal of real science, and frame for its wrangling votaries a doctrine which shall ensure their spontaneous concurrence and coöperation? Then it is not in either of the rival schools, now contending for the mastery, that the elements of that one catholic creed of reason must be sought. Only by rejecting their incidental errors and combining their residual truths, can we secure rational agreement. If we concede to the positivist that our knowledge is both finite and of the finite, and that faith is complemental to it, in practically apprehending the infinite, we may still maintain, with the absolutist,

that the sphere of our knowledge is ever encroaching upon the sphere of our faith, and that therefore the two are ideally or ultimately coincident; in other words, that positive science is indefinitely extensible towards absolute science. Or if we concede to the absolutist that our knowledge is hypothetically infinite, and may even be imagined as at length swallowing up faith in intuition, or surmounting it with logic, we might still maintain with the positivist, that the goal of our knowledge is but an ideal of our faith, and as such, though ever to be approached, is never to be attained; in other words, that absolute science is only perfectible through positive science. And when we have thus embraced in one view both provinces of cognition, the phænomenal together with the noumenal, the laws of facts together with their causes, the finite together with the infinite, the discoverable together with the revealable, we shall have that *Omne Scibile*, or exhaustive theory of the knowable, by which philosophy can survey the very infinitude of reality as her domain and anticipate a progressive science thereof as her career.

And will it finally be her mission to organize a system of such perfect knowledge, to exhibit the ever growing sciences in their logical relations, according to their normal order, and deduce the axioms which determine their evolution and perfection? Then in vain shall we look exclusively to either of the two extreme systems, now dividing the empire of knowledge into hostile factions. Not only are both alike incomplete, but we cannot even suppose the one complete without the other, or triumphing at the expense of the other. Take by itself the absolutism of Hegel, the most logical ideal of the universe ever conceived by man, and what is it, with all its brilliant categories of thought, but a mere airy speculation, the toy-world of a creature vainly mimicking the Creator? Or take by itself the positivism of Comte, the most rigorous construction of phænomena ever devised by man, and what is it with all its imposing masses of fact, but a mere baseless generalization, no better than the myth of the world-upholding elephant standing upon nothing? But imagine now a system in which both of these systems shall have been thoroughly sifted and blended; fancy a positivism empirically

correcting and perfecting the ideas of the absolutist, and an absolutism rationally explaining and harmonizing the phenomena of the positivist, the former ever ascending inductively from facts towards the same principles from which the latter is ever deductively descending towards the same facts; and then think of the physical sciences issuing from the one, as complemented by the metaphysical sciences issuing from the other, and of both as proceeding together, in their respective provinces of research, under ascertained laws, with ceaseless accessions, throughout the universe of reality, towards the very fulness of absolute truth,—and we shall have that *Scientia Scientiarum*, or vision of ever-expanding knowledge, in which philosophy may find her noblest function discharged, and her highest mission accomplished.

It appears, therefore, that the two philosophies are true in what they affirm, and false only in what they deny, or that they become erroneous simply by being pursued against or without each other; and that in proportion as they could be combined in theory and practice, they would but exhibit to us complemental aspects of the same reality, related truths of the same facts, and together tend towards perfect knowledge itself, like geometrical lines which we know must ever approach, even if they never meet.

Our last argument is, that this reconciliation, besides being thus desirable and conceivable, would seem at length to be already imminent and practicable. It could not have been effected hitherto, and may be effected now.

If it be asked why it could not have been effected hitherto, or why, with both tendencies in action for ages, there should have been such a recurrence of the same speculative errors, we reply, that this may have been necessary in order to expose conclusively their separate weakness and absolute need of each other; or, howsoever that may be, that it is at least a fact, that never before have they been driven to those wild extremes, those last conceivable limits, into which they have at length diverged; nor consequently have they ever before developed so favorable an exigency for precipitating their own mutual recoil and coalition. As it was reserved for Hegel to carry an exclusive absolutism to the very climax of absur-

dity, by confounding thoughts with things, identifying creation with logic, and converting deity into humanity, so it only remained for Comte to drive an exclusive positivism to a like pitch of folly, by ignoring realities for phenomena, evaporating causes into fictions, and substituting humanity in place of deity. Any farther in either direction, it is not possible for errant philosophy to go; and the only alternatives left to her are, either to relapse into her old antagonisms, or start forward under their resultant impulse, in a new career of ever-unfolding knowledge.

And that the great reconciliation is already practicable, actually within the capacity of the human intellect, cannot be doubted by any one who will thoughtfully survey the philosophical world at the present moment. Not only is that theory of perfect knowledge, here indeed but too feebly indicated, an ideal toward which many minds from different points are groping with more or less intelligent aspiration; not only is it such an ideal as can alone satisfy the cognitive instinct, else to be forever baffled or bewildered; and not only is its fulfillment logically required by the whole previous development and present exigency of reason, but the very means and materials, as well as motives, for its fulfillment are at hand, in that mass of accumulating sciences and arts, which now offers itself for logical organization, in that spirit of catholic research which is spreading through all the sects of school, church, and state, and in that unprecedented interchange of thought, which is rallying advanced thinkers from different lands and of diverse creeds, to the final problems of philosophy.

It is true that such an intellectual palingenesia, whensoever and howsoever effected, could not burst upon the world, as in an ordinary crisis, with any of the suddenness or amazement which mark a great religious reformation or political revolution. Rather must it proceed in secresy and silence, remote from general observation and without popular applause, like those grand hidden forces of nature, the very thought of which awes the lonely student into worship, while the common mind, engrossed with mere appearance, scarcely suspects their existence, or only derides them as wordy abstractions, until it finds itself in presence of their surprising results.

It is true, too, that no single mind, or people, or even generation, occupied with this great work of organizing science and art, can hope alone to accomplish it, or claim the whole glory of the achievement. In an age when

> "The individual withers, and the world is more and more,"

we must expect great themes to multiply great thinkers, and not imagine that, even in the region of reflection, we can escape that division of labor which, in the lower plane of discovery and invention, retains the most distant strangers as coworkers, and often brings them from their simultaneous researches, as rival claimants to the feet of science.

And it is true, still further, that this final philosophy, as now projected in any minds, can be scarcely more than a vague ideal, while to some minds it may appear to be as visionary as it is vague, until it shall have been actually reduced to a system, expressed in definite propositions, and applied to the practical interests of life. In this it is but like every other ideal, whether of philanthropy or of religion. And yet, even prior to a full realization of it, and in advance of any direct efforts towards it, there is enough of certainty and grandeur in it to enkindle all minds with hope and exultation.

We can at least forecast its prevailing spirit. We know that it will be at an equal remove from the extreme methods hitherto pursued. It will be, what the very word philosophy itself expresses, the wooing of wisdom as distinguished alike from the conceit which arrogates it, and the folly which despises it. It will aim at conscious knowledge in contrast both with "learned ignorance" and with "intellectual intuition;" and it will proclaim the doctrine of a progressive science, in opposition at once to a "prudent nescience," and to a fancied omniscience. It will neither affect to know nothing, nor assume to know everything; but only seek ever to know more and more. It will be the philosophy of undying hope, as separated not less from presumption than from despair, and of rational faith as superior alike to credulity and to unbelief. It may take for its watchword not merely, "Crede, ut intelligas," nor solely, "Intellige ut credas," but simply both maxims in one, "Fides quærens Intellectum:

Intellectus quærens Fidem" (Faith seeking Knowledge: Knowledge seeking Faith). And it might find its symbol not in the Egyptian obelisk towering with hieroglyphic secrets towards the Infinite, nor yet in the Greek pediment, cowering with its sculptured gods in the Finite; but rather in that resultant expression of both Finite and Infinite, blending and rising together in the Christian spire.

We may also attempt its provisional definition. As philosophy is the passion for wisdom, the inquiry into the reason of things, the search for the laws and causes of facts, a complete system of such rational inquiry, an approved theory and art of such scientific knowledge, by which all modes of research should be fitly joined in all fields of research, and the whole mass of facts referred to their due causes and laws, would be philosophy consummated. Such philosophy, it may be shown, can only be attained by logically vindicating and combining reason and revelation as the two great correlate factors of knowledge in their respective provinces of science and religion; and it should, for several reasons, be termed the final philosophy.

In the first place, as to all previous philosophy, it would be final. Not only would it come last chronologically in the succession of mere philosophical systems, but it would also ensue logically as their legitimate growth and complement; ending their disputes, furthering their progress, and finishing their tasks. Alike to the positivist and to the absolutist it would offer an attested revelation, making known what the former ignores as unknowable, and rendering real what the latter treats as ideal, the Infinite and Absolute Cause of the world; and while giving such empirical content to the metaphysical sciences on one side, it would also afford rational support and consistency to the physical sciences on the other. At the extreme point which both have reached after centuries of independent research, it would come to supply their confessed ignorance and complete their fragmentary knowledge. We can easily conceive of the whole history of philosophy as thus maturing into some one last philosophy; we have traced its conditions and signs as appearing in the present speculative emergency; and advanced thinkers are already, more or

less consciously, rallying toward it as the only remaining resort of reason.

In the second place, as to the very process of philosophy, it would be final. Besides practically checking and guiding the errant human reason in the scientific region, it would intellectually aid it with an infallible divine revelation in the religious region, and thus secure all the light possible in both regions of research. It would enlist in the great quest for truth the whole human with the divine intelligence; not alone the seers, sages and scientists, but also the prophets, apostles and saints of all time. Unless we adopt the vain conceit that philosophy has been or could be perfected at one stroke by any one philosopher, we must regard it as the common labour of associated minds, through successive generations, and include in it every legitimate means of inquiry. We have seen that for centuries past the respective votaries of reason and revelation have thus been co-acting in the history of philosophy, defining the processes of the one and accumulating the evidences of the other; and now it only remains, by combining and completing their labours, to link the two together, under logical rules, as in the last mature effort for knowledge.

And in the third place, as to the whole aim of philosophy, it would be final. Instead of exhausting or restricting the cognitive capacity of reason, it would feed and enlarge it with an omniscient revelation. It would attach the human intellect to the Divine intellect for a career of endless tuition, and lead it forth through all worlds and ages, toward the ever-receding goal of infinite knowledge and absolute truth. For not only is the process of science discursive and social, unfolding from generation to generation, but its material is inexhaustible, diffused throughout immensity and eternity; and even if the whole terrestrial intelligence had been fully matured and disciplined, it could not look for an immediate comprehension of the universe of reality, but only for a ceaseless course of discovery and revelation, tending toward an ideal omniscience ever to be approached, but never attained. However visionary now may seem such a prospect, yet we instinctively yearn after it as we apprehend it, and piety exults in it, no

less than philosophy, as alike the heaven of the saint and the elysium of the sage.

But we may even advance a step further and begin to project in outline the issuing system of that final philosophy, the rise and growth of which has thus been traced, and the conception of which is becoming so vivid and attractive. Though as yet but few minds may have consciously seized its ideal or intelligently mastered its processes, yet already its desired combination and organization of human and divine knowledge has been proceeding under spontaneous affinities and laws still to be ascertained and vindicated. Already the essential and prospective harmony of science and religion may be discerned in several particulars: 1st. The chief authorities in each science can be cited as harbingers and witnesses of such harmony; 2d. The clearly ascertained facts in each science are in proved agreement with the plainly revealed truths; 3d. The opposing hypotheses in each science may be provisionally adjusted to the conflicting dogmas; 4th. The modern marvels in each science are making credible the ancient miracles. One after another, as we now proceed to show, the sciences have been bringing these four testimonies to their own growing harmony with religion.

Astronomy has come with such illustrious witnesses as Copernicus, who craved in his epitaph no other grace than that vouchsafed the penitent thief on the cross; Kepler, whose rapturous Eureka was a declaration that he could wait a century for readers, since the Almighty had waited thousands of years for a discoverer; Newton, who literally studied the law of the Lord in both His word and works, and kindled the very mathematics of the Principia into praise; and the Herschels, father and son, whose tomb still proclaims how one generation shall show the works of Jehovah to another. Devout astronomers for centuries have been building celestial physics upon natural theology as their only rational basis, and illustrating with growing proof the immensity, eternity, omnipotence, omnipresence and immutability of Him who hath established His faithfulness in the heavens and garnished them by His Spirit. If some of them, with pious intent, have renounced the theory of the nebular origin and destiny of suns and planets, yet others, like Mädler, Whewell and Mitchel, with equal faith, have accepted it as but the

method of that Divine wisdom which prepared the heavens of old, and shall yet cause them to vanish like smoke, and be no more. No miraculous pause of the sun in his course could be more wonderful than the stupendous motions of the solar system itself. No single new star in the East can seem more incredible than the countless galaxies which have since been discovered. The spectral light of other worlds is beginning to fall, like a new revelation, upon the whole question of the heavenly state and destiny, and their etherial vibrations may yet thrill with magnetic thought and sympathy in those predicted new heavens, wherein dwelleth righteousness.

Geology has brought such great names as Robert Boyle, a founder of the Royal Society and of the first apologetic lectureship, who never mentioned the name of God without a reverent pause; John Ray, the first to unite natural history with natural theology; Cuvier, who fancied himself bidden, like the prophet, to evoke the dry bones of buried nature into life; and Ritter, who avowedly wrote his magnificent work as his song of praise to God. Hosts of believing physicists have sought rational foundation and cement for the whole terrestrial system in the power, wisdom and goodness of the Creator as displayed by His manifold works in all the earth. While a few of them may still doubt the accordance of the new geology with Genesis, the many, with Hugh Miller, Dana, and Guyot, are seeking to identify the long cosmogonic eras with the six days wherein God made heaven and earth and all that in them is. The former deluge and the coming conflagration may be more dramatic but are not more real marvels than the glacial and igneous epochs for which many geologists would plead. Ships now carry to our antipodes that Divine Word which was once held to deny their existence, or consign them to the nether world of the lost. While all physical geography attests the curse upon the ground for man's sake, all political geography is steadily revealing the predicted new earth when the desert shall blossom as the rose.

Anthropology has been yielding such high authorities as Linnæus, who declared that he stood mute with amazement at the inconceivable Divine wisdom displayed through all living nature; Roget, Prout, and Bell, who devoted their

great names and attainments to the high argument for a God; Prichard and Agassiz, who ever included the Scriptures among the sources of scientific information; and the numerous missionary ethnologists, linguists, and antiquarians who have become authorities in science as well as martyrs to their faith. Though as yet the mass of devout physiologists may repudiate the very notion of a secular evolution of human from animal species, yet there are some already querying, with Mivart, Henslow, and Peabody, if it be not the true scientific explanation of the manner in which God formed man out of the dust of the earth ere He breathed into him a living soul. Whether the human family be of one race or many races, the first Adam and the second Adam would still be their chief moral representatives. The confusion of tongues at Babel and their miraculous fusion at Pentecost cannot present greater difficulties than the complicated problem of the origin and destiny of languages. The new Christian humanity already begins to put all things under its feet. Vaccination and chloroform are mitigating the curse of disease and pain; the industrial arts are beating the sword into the ploughshare; and as man subdues the wild earth, the lion may yet lie down with the lamb in a paradise regained.

Psychology has been founded by such religious thinkers as Descartes, who claimed the title of defender of the faith; Hartley, who wrote a tract on the truth of the Christian religion; Kant, who adored God in the moral law within, not less than in the starry heavens above; Hamilton, whose motto was that on earth there is nothing great but man and in man, nothing great but mind; and the long line of speculative divines who have become eminent in logic, ethics and æsthetics as well as in all pure living and sound doctrine. Not only have they been gathering fresh evidence of the moral attributes of God from the phenomena of reason and conscience; but they have also begun to base the peculiar doctrines of grace upon ascertained mental laws in the mind of the flesh as well as of the spirit. If most of them utterly repudiate the new hypothesis of a gradual evolution of force into will, sense into thought, and matter into mind, yet there are signs that a few are getting ready to reconcile it with the doctrine of the

growth of the new creature in the grace and knowledge of Christ. Whether man be a necessary or a free agent, he is held both by Scripture and by Nature to be responsible for his acts. The miraculous gifts, revelations and conversions of the apostolic age are not half so incredible as the analogous claims and beliefs of millions at the present day. Some scientific persons are such believers in the future life of the soul that they profess to have gained the most strangely minute information concerning it. No predicted marvels of the resurrection can now seem to us greater than the extant wonders of the heliotype, the telegraph and the spectroscope. As the psychic powers of man are unfolded, he is strangely coming into ethereal relations with things unseen and eternal, and may begin to imagine how the glorified spirit might be more gloriously transfigured and appareled than the Raphaels and Gabriels of devout fancy.

Sociology may be said to have been heralded by such devout civilians as Grotius, the author of the first modern treatise on the Christian evidences, and Vico who cherished an unwavering religious faith in the midst of calumny, disease and death; as well as by such intelligent divines as Bossuet, the Eagle of Meaux, who surveyed as from a lofty peak the whole panorama of universal history, and Jonathan Edwards, who, at a still diviner height, beheld the vast scheme of human redemption from its rise in the kindling morn of creation to its setting in the gorgeous pageant of the judgment. While most sacred historians have hitherto rejected the idea of a spontaneous development of society, with ever growing arts, sciences and polities, yet a few, in a more scientific spirit, have sought to conceive of the whole divine economy as proceeding from small beginnings, like the branching tree from a mustard seed, or the mighty forest from a handful of corn. Whatever abstract views may be held as to the compatibility of great social laws with Divine sovereignty and human freedom, it is certain that the two agencies do actually concur, as a smaller within a larger sphere, in the whole process of history. The signs and wonders which marked the origin and early progress of the Church may not be more miraculous, in the view of all heavenly principalities and powers, than the moral triumphs with

which it is still wrestling against the rulers of the darkness of this world; and as it ever marches onward, appropriating and transforming the whole accompanying civilization, blending culture with faith, and resolving art into worship, it may yet burst upon the world with such a universal social regeneration as shall more than realize the utopia of the philanthropist in the millennium of the prophet.

Theology has been espoused and defended by such scientific theists as Nieuwentyt, the Religious Philosopher, who dropt that illustrative watch upon which Paley stumbled eighty years afterwards; Leibnitz, whose Theodicea was designed to harmonize reason and faith; Samuel Clarke, Berkeley, and Butler, who laid a basis for the Evidences of the Christian religion in the metaphysical, physical and psychical sciences; to say nothing of the more professional divines of every age and school who have striven to incorporate the whole existing rational theology with the revealed, in one compact body of truth. Many of them may not even have imagined a natural history of religion, such as the scientific theologians are advocating, yet Bishop Butler long ago suggested that the entire historic development of the Christian scheme of redemption may be as natural as the visible known course of things. The divine insignia by which it has ever distinguished itself from the other religions of the world, may be only enhanced as it steadily proceeds to reject their errors and absorb their truths, until at last it shall stand forth as the one absolute and universal religion, the faithful and accepted gospel of the Saviour of mankind.

Philosophy herself, from the earliest time, has been gathering in her train, as forerunners of her own sacred ideal, such fathers of Christian science as Justin, who was styled the Philosopher and the Martyr; Clement of Alexandria, who first solved in Christianity the problems of Plato; and St. Augustine, who first defended it with the logic of Aristotle: such scholars of Christian science as John Scotus Erigena, who declared that true philosophy and true religion are one; Albertus Magnus, so called because he was great in physics, greater in metaphysics, greatest in theology; and Roger Bacon, the saint and the martyr as well as the physicist:

such reformers of Christian science as Francis Bacon, who freed natural philosophy from scholastic bondage; Bishop Butler who brought religion into analogy with the course of nature; and after these great leaders their countless followers who ever since have been striving to bridge over or close up the yawning chasm between science and faith. If some excellent divines have at times denounced all philosophy as vain and deceitful, like that which prevailed at Corinth, yet others with St. Paul and Calvin have been able to distinguish between the philosophy that is sound and truthful and one that is after the rudiments of this world and not after Christ. And though many have begun to despair of such a true Christian philosophy as but a fanciful ideal of the fathers and the schoolmen, yet a few can only see in each successive failure a nearer approach to success, and still yearn with growing faith and hope after the riches of the full assurance of knowledge. No beatific vision or millennial apocalypse of truth can seem too mystical or miraculous to follow the brilliant intellects and growing sciences that for ages have been anticipating and heralding it. Already the divine wisdom revealed in Scripture has been found congruous with that discovered in Nature, and the marvellous knowledge hitherto attending their separate growth and increase only helps us to imagine with what enhanced splendor they shall pour their blended rays upon the world.

Nor could there be conceived a problem more sublime and momentous than that which thus still remains to be solved. To ascertain the respective spheres, prerogatives, and methods of human reason and divine revelation; to adjust their reciprocal relations on principles binding upon the adherents of both; to apply such principles throughout the sciences to all pending controversies, with the view of sifting error from truth; to gather by this means evidence of a growing harmony between the two great bodies of knowledge, as they accumulate and advance, supporting, interpenetrating, and illustrating each other; in a word, to gradually heal that immense schism which for centuries has been stealthily invading the most cherished opinions and interests of mankind, and thenceforward to link the divine and the human reason, in their

joint process through coming ages, against all earthly error and sin,—these are objects which have only to be stated in order to be felt in all their moral value and grandeur. They are not the transient concerns of any calling, sect, or party, but the lasting and catholic interests of humanity. And though no single mind or generation may achieve them, yet the bare conception and attempt would themselves be their own sufficient reward. To be simply living at a time when such an ideal is but beginning to dawn among men, must seem to one who rises to its full comprehension, the richest boon that has yet been conferred upon them, and, in the first joy of its discovery, he might almost tremble lest it be too good and glorious ever to become real, or through some fault or want in nature, should fall short of fulfillment, could he not find, on surveying the scale and resources of creation, that the order of the world is not less fixed than is its progress sure.

Viewed in one light, such questions are indeed suited to daunt the most reckless speculation. What mortal wisdom can reap two such vast fields of knowledge, or bind into sheaves such varied harvests of truth! How jealous is reason of faith, and faith of reason! And how warily must either venture within the bounds of the other! To link the jarring sciences, material and moral, rational and revealed, into one series, by one method, and to one aim; to organize a true hierarchy in this present anarchy of knowledge, divine and human,—this is no mere wordy pastime of philosophers, but an arduous task from which all earnest souls would but shrink in proportion as they comprehend it.

Viewed in another light, however, such questions only nerve while they tempt our curiosity. What a mass of human interests hangs upon their issue! What a medley of human opinions is involved in their solution! How all human duty and destiny concentrate in the problem of reconciling the finite with the Infinite reason! and how all human history points to the goal where science returns into Omniscience, the earth becomes subject to man, and man to God! The unity of nature and Scripture, the marriage of reason and faith, the perfection of knowledge, the triumph of art, the regeneration

of society,—these, in their order, are linked ideals of prophecy and philosophy, which at once overawe and charm us into an enthusiasm that must grow in fervor as it grows in humility and caution.

"And here," said the greatest of philosophers, after a like argument, "I cannot but reflect how appositely that answer of Themistocles may be applied to myself which he made to the deputy of a small village haranguing upon great things, 'Friend, thy words require a city.' For so it may be said of my views that they require an age, perhaps a whole age, to prove, and numerous ages to execute. But as the greatest things are owing to their beginnings, it will be enough for me to have sown for posterity, and the honor of the Immortal Being, whom I humbly entreat, through His Son, our Saviour, favorably to accept these, and the like sacrifices of the human understanding, seasoned with religion, and offered up to His glory!"

CHAPTER V.

PHILOSOPHIA ULTIMA: PROJECT OF THE PERFECTED SCIENCES AND ARTS.

WHOEVER will survey the present state of human knowledge, will at first be amazed at its vast extent, its rapid increase, and the grandeur of the monuments with which it is filling the world. On every side he will behold the fables of mythology turned into facts, and the marvels of prophecy passing into history before his eyes. He may even fancy all that he now witnesses in science and art to be but like the mighty preparations for a future building whereof only the foundations have been laid, while the superstructure as yet is scarcely conceived. But no sooner shall he turn from his ideal temple of knowledge in search of actual workers to fashion and frame it together, than he will be shocked to find them wrangling in bitter feuds over their task, or toiling apart without plan and concert, or rallying confusedly to the work, or scattering from it in chagrin and despair, until they seem to him like the infatuated builders on the plains of Shinar, confounded by the anger of Heaven in the midst of some impious labor. And he will be ready to fancy that the genius of human philosophy is but doomed to sit down and weep amid the magnificent ruins of a work which she had begun but could not finish.

Then let him turn from the present and take counsel with the past. History will lie spread out beneath him like a vast quarry wrought by successive generations, and already strewn

with fragmentary truths, which are as the chiseled stones of a structure hitherto without model even in the fancy of the builders, as they wrought apart each at his own task; but now, at last, the plan of the Divine Architect may be displayed, the master-workmen in each science marshalled, and the perfect temple of knowledge reared, to the glory of God and for the good of mankind.

This mature effort and final task of the human mind may be anticipated under the name of the Ultimate Philosophy, or that last summative science which is to be the fruit and goal and crown of all the sciences, as well as the means of their highest use and grandeur. Before the cognitive instinct can be satisfied, and the mass of knowledge rendered exact, coherent, and operative, the sciences themselves must be made the subject of science; must become the material, as well as instrument, of research, and their product, like other phænomena, be brought within the sphere of rational prevision and control. If we could imagine them perfected singly and apart, there would still remain the work of bringing them into logical connection, organizing them as a compact system, and concentrating them intelligently upon the social well-being; but this work really enters into their growth as well as fruition, and is so essential, they may as little thrive without it as branches severed from a common tree. To discover these vital relations among them, to arrange them in their normal order, to distinguish their kinds, measure their resources, ascertain the laws of their evolution and interaction, and at length frame a theory by means of which their whole historic procedure may not only be reviewed and foreseen, but itself corrected, guided, and matured,—this is the ideal of the ultimate philosophy. Itself the latest offspring of science, equipped with all means and modes of knowledge, it aims to traverse the entire domain of intelligence, everywhere sifting the known from the unknown, and gathering the fragments of truth into an intelligible and consistent whole. It is, in a word, that science of science which science itself shall yield, and wherefrom are to be shed upon the world the full flower and fruitage of reason.

The conception, the necessity, the utility, the rise and

growth, and the method of this ultimate philosophy are topics which admit of enlarged treatment hereafter. Three great works are included in its project as the tasks of the present and coming generations: 1st. Its construction out of the sciences; 2d. Its application to the sciences; 3d. Its consummation of the sciences. We here simply propound them as themes, condensing into sentences what might be expanded into volumes.

The work of constructing the ultimate philosophy must begin with an *Expurgation of the Sciences.* By this is meant the sifting from them of those prejudices, physical, metaphysical, and theological, (the *idola* of Bacon), which are the offspring of their own rank growth and schismatic culture, and which now hinder direct access to the whole body of knowledge as it lies scattered among the different professions and in various departments of learning. When the eye of reason is thus purged of all films of conceit and passion, and the prospect cleared of every mist and cloud of error, it will be ready to embrace in one view the whole field of truth, of whatever sort and wherever found.

The next step will therefore be this *Survey of the Sciences*, or particular examination of their several provinces and products. This will include the definition and description of each species, and a consequent classification or arrangement of them, which shall be accurate, complete, and consistent, which shall neither degrade the physical sciences as in German philosophy, nor the metaphysical as in English philosophy, nor the theological as in French philosophy, but annexing the physical to the metaphysical, and complementing both with the theological, shall exhibit them together in the order of nature, of history, of reason, and of sound culture. They will thus be fully digested and prepared as the material of induction, or as the intellectual phænomena to be studied and explained.

It will then remain to frame a *Theory of the Sciences*, or doctrine of perfect knowledge. This will result, like every sound theory, from combined conjecture and induction; will embrace all the facts both of the nature and of the history of

human intelligence; and will be verified by its power to revise and explain the whole existing product of science, as well as to previse and regulate its whole subsequent process. Concentrating the accumulated experience of the race upon the problem of philosophy, it will neither neglect inquiry into the laws of phænomena, nor ignore inquiry into the causes of phænomena, nor yet detach both these from the revelation of the ground and source of phænomena; but will rather combine revelation and reason as complementary means of cognition throughout the entire realm of cognition, and so aim to resume the knowledge of laws and of causes in the knowledge of God, that only First and Final Cause of laws, in whom all phænomena rest and move with perpetual and manifold reflection of His glory.

Thus, according to a true doctrine of knowledge, the sciences, when thoroughly expurgated and surveyed, may be reduced from a mere medley to a system in which their procession shall correspond to that of the phænomena with which they are concerned; the law of their growth shall be a gradual coincidence of reason and revelation; their perpetual effort shall be a logical review of the Divine Intelligence by the human intelligence, through all the categories of fact, from the mathematics in which the universe has its primordial root, to the theology in which it finds its perennial flower; and their goal, ever to be approached but never attained, shall be that omniscience wherewith, looking back as with the eye of God through all His word and works and ways, we shall know even as also we are known.

With the formation and verification of a theory of the sciences, the work of constructing the ultimate philosophy would be accomplished. And it would mark the utmost limit of human cognition. Reason will have entered its last province when it thus retires to reflect upon its own product. The speculative propensity will have attempted its crowning task when it thus seeks the law of its own action and clearly proposes to itself the ideal of its own conscious aspiration. Science will have no other, as it could have no higher aim, when it thus strives to know itself. This first work might therefore be called the science of the sciences.

But if we now suppose such a theory to have been propounded, we would not be content to cherish it as a mere toy of speculation or creature of the philosophic fancy, but be ready to return with it among the sciences from which it was drawn, and apply it as an organ of their further culture, or as the means not merely of observing and explaining, but also of correcting and maturing their processes, of making the imperfect profit by the mistakes of the perfect, and giving them, as a whole, a more precise, concerted and accelerated action. In other words, a doctrine of the cognitive and the cognizable having been framed, it would then remain to bring the former systematically to bear upon the latter.

This next work of applying the ultimate philosophy would involve the preliminary labor of a logical partition of the sciences with a view to their more systematic culture. The arbitrary divisions and assumptions which now prevail among them not only dismember the body of truth, but lead to ill-directed researches and strifes of words; but when they are cultivated in their normal order and with reference to their ideal unity, their growth will be more regular, vigorous, and fruitful. Now, according to our theory, their normal order corresponds to that of the interdependent phænomena which are their material; and their ideal unity results from two opposite modes of knowing or explaining those phænomena, ever tending to logical union in a third. When, therefore, we have thus mapped out the intellectual domain as it lies in nature itself rather than in our crude fancy, we may proceed to devise three corresponding sets of logical canons or rules for the three kinds of intellectual labor to be performed therein.

The first would embrace the *Logic of the Empirical Sciences*, or precepts for pursuing and perfecting our knowledge of natural laws. They will be of various classes: 1. Those which apply to nomological science in general, the organon or rationale of inductive research. 2. Those which apply to the physical sciences in particular, as mechanics, chemistry, and organics; in both their celestial and terrestrial divisions. 3. Those which apply to the psychical sciences in particular,

as psychology, sociology and theology, in both their celestial and terrestrial divisions. This part of the scientific discipline, when complete, would include a system of rules for connecting every class of facts with its laws, and each higher law with the Highest.

The second part would embrace the *Logic of the Metaphysical Sciences*, or precepts for pursuing and perfecting our knowledge of causes. They will also be of various classes: 1. Those which apply to teleological science in general. 2. Those which hold in the physical sciences, affording the evidences of natural religion. 3. Those which hold in the psychical sciences, affording the evidences of revealed religion. This part of the scientific discipline, when complete, would include a system of rules for connecting every class of laws with its causes, and all second causes with the one great First Cause.

The third part would embrace the *Logic of the Science of the Sciences*, or precepts for maintaining and correlating reason and revelation as complemental factors of knowledge throughout both the empirical and the metaphysical realms of research. These, too, will be of several classes: 1. Those which apply to the normal relations of reason and revelation in the scale of the sciences, and will yield us an ideal of perfect knowledge, divine and human. 2. Those which apply to the present disturbed relations of reason and revelation, and will serve to adjust the existing scientific and religious bodies of knowledge. 3. Those which apply to the prospective relations of reason and revelation in the sciences, and afford evidence of their growing harmony and inevitable perfection. This third and last part of the scientific discipline, in order to be complete, would include a system of rules for combining all laws and causes in God, the Author and Ruler of the universe, the Alpha and the Omega of creation, from whose divine reason it has logically proceeded, and through whose infallible revelation alone can it be logically recapitulated.

Thus the true organon of knowledge, whensoever attained, will rescue the cognitive mind from those irregular and conflicting researches with which it is now blindly sallying over the field of truth; and, everywhere adjusting the system of thought to the system of things, and leading the finite upon

the track of Infinite Reason, will slowly realize, through endless ages, in the soul of the creature, for the glory of the Creator, the grand ideal of the whole creation.

By means of such a complete logic of the sciences, the ultimate philosophy would be thoroughly applied. And the discipline of the human intellect would then be perfect. Reason will have become a faultless instrument of research, when it thus moves by a trained logic, as well as with a true aim. Science will have grown to be its own master, when it thus guides as well as knows itself. This second work, therefore, might be called the art of the sciences.

But so soon as we imagine such a scheme of axioms devised and employed among the sciences, we shall see that the tendency will be not merely to build them up into an ideal system as for philosophic pastime, but to effect their logical organization, practical equipment, and the actual endowing of mankind with all material and moral, as well as intellectual riches. Such is the connection between theory and practice, science and art, truth and goodness, that whenever the whole cognitive shall have thoroughly acted upon the whole cognizable, there must issue a vast and homogeneous body of knowledge, fraught with inconceivable utility and grandeur. In other words, the science of the sciences and the art of the sciences, will need to be crowned with a science of their corresponding arts, or doctrine of perfect knowledge, as practically applied.

This third and last work of consummating the ultimate philosophy would no doubt bring with itself, in its initiatory stage, a clearer and more general apprehension of those social laws by which science or exact knowledge becomes effective in moulding human opinions and institutions. So long as the artificial organization of society proceeds blindly, its action must be abnormal and wild; but when the intellectual and moral conditions of true order and progress are demonstrated, we may at least foresee, if not actually hasten, the grand issues of the whole human development in its vital connections with all terrestrial and even celestial influences.

The first of these issues may be termed the *Ultimate System*

of the Sciences. All previous organizations of the body of knowledge share in its existing schismatic and fragmentary state. Instead of building the temple of truth after the model of things, they exhibit creation but as a disjointed fabric, wrought out of the crude and composite material of creature-fancy. Instead of exactly imaging the outer world of fact into the inner world of thought, they show it only in dim and broken reflection as marred by conceit and error. But when all phænomena are studied in their actual successions and co-existences, and not in mere detached portions, and the sciences are partitioned and cultivated accordingly, as an organic whole, then will the chaos which the universe presents to the human mind be changing to the cosmos which it presents to the divine mind, and reason be fairly embarked in her career of ever nearing, but never reaching that height of infinite knowledge, from whence, by means of the physical sciences, she could review and forecast all material life, whether of atoms or of orbs, and by means of the psychical sciences, she could review and forecast all spiritual life, whether of terrestrial or celestial races. "Now we see through a glass darkly, but then face to face; now we know in part, but when that which is perfect is come, that which is in part shall be done away."

In close connection with this issue will also be unfolded the *Ultimate System of Arts.* At present, anything like a more systematic control of nature, by means of a more systematic knowledge of her connected laws, is scarcely attempted or even so much as deemed open to human aspiration. As the sciences, broken and jarring, extend only to detached phænomena, without including their vital relations, so the corresponding arts, or means of modifying those phænomena, are in like manner partial, irregular, and conflicting. The frame of nature is forced to work in piecemeal for her still unskillful master; and it is only in the electric telegraph that we have a hint of a more cosmical power. But when the sciences are more logically organized, and the arts begin to flow from them as foregone aims rather than mere incidental trophies, and with concerted action furthering each other, then will our increasing knowledge be ever yielding increasing control of all surrounding phænomena, and man be rising toward the predicted

dominion over creation. Theology will be giving that art of religion by which Providence predominates over society, and sociology that art of politics by which society predominates over the individual, and psychology that art of ethics by which mind predominates over matter, and biology, chemistry and mechanics, those arts of terrestrial economy by which the whole material system is wrought anew for human service and divine glory.

And last of all, as the grand aggregate result, there will issue the *Ultimate System of Society.* In a philosophical view, both the sciences and the arts are but functions of society, and by their degree of perfection determine its state and progress. As yet the most advanced civilization, racked and torn by conflicting ideas and interests, only reflects the existing disorder and defectiveness of knowledge and consequent waste and turmoil of skill. The whole modern organization of mankind is crude, forced, and heterogeneous, although already an immense advance upon that of antiquity. But when the seriate sciences shall be shedding forth their seriate arts, and all human societies be growing together in the knowledge and mastery of their own phænomena, and of the cosmical phænomena upon which they act, until they are brought into harmony with nature and with God, then will a regenerate race be installed as the living head of the whole terrestrial organism, and the reins of the orb be exultingly gathered in its hands as it careers in the Olympic race of worlds.

Then, too, may even the celestial sciences begin to blossom with celestial arts that shall knit together, in spiritual sympathy, all celestial races. Terrene, solar, and stellar influences, wielded by human prowess and prayer, may unfold the commerce of heaven, the telegraph of the skies, and the worship of the one universal Father, until the ripe, scient earth echoes back the anthem that erst hailed her novitiate, when "the morning stars sang together and all the sons of God shouted for joy."

Thus, in the consummation of such remote issues, will be involved the consummation of all things earthly. Science will then have triumphed over error, and art over nature.

Reason will then have unfolded the whole riddle of the world from its genesis to its apocalypse; and that cosmic ideal towards which the Creator has been moving through mighty epochs of creation, from the primordial planetary germ, by means of successive strata, floras, faunas, and human nations and races, will at length stand forth revealed in the fullness of its life and glory.

At the height we have now reached, how wide the horizon! how grand the prospect! As from a lone eminence of faith, with the whole past and present and future of our race spread out at one view, we look down upon that divine system of the world, in which the end is known from the beginning. We see long ages rolling onward ere it shall all be fulfilled, vast literatures and civilizations shed like forest leaves in its fulfilling, and unspeakable glories crowding thick and fast to its fulfillment, until, blinded by the vision, we almost wonder that mortal may gaze and live. But we will not doubt His fatherly goodness, who, having shown unto His human children even the far-off stars in their destined courses and periods, will surely deign not less that they should scan the track of His earthly promises, and give them some Pisgah where they may lie down and die content that other generations shall enter into that for which they have toiled.

And hence it behooves us next to consider, as being our part in the scheme, the more practical questions of the time, the scene, and the mode of its inauguration.

For the time of its inauguration, all history points to the present age. An era of the world, so fraught with marvels and rife in great movements, might well be crowned with this last and best birth of time. And we have only to review the past and survey the present in order to see that what could not hitherto, may at last now be hopefully attempted. It could not have been undertaken at any previous period, because the two reformations, the one religious the other scientific, of which Luther and Bacon were the leaders, had first to proceed apart to their extremes, and so develop the existing need of their combination. At their spring and while in their incipiency, neither feared nor craved the other. Both were intent only upon freeing reason from

its trammels, whether ecclesiastical or scholastic, and could not then foresee its present license and discord, or the necessity which has thus arisen, of training it to study science itself, with the same directness, patience, and candor, wherewith they trained it to study nature and Scripture.

It is indeed true that in advance of the exigency, that majestic, prescient mind which planned the *Instauratio Magna* would seem to have propounded the very task which is now imminent, or at least, so much of it as relates to the natural sciences, though with no real expectation of seeing it then accomplished. "The sixth and last part of our work, to which all the rest are subservient, is to lay down that philosophy which shall flow from the just, pure, and strict inquiry hitherto proposed. But to perfect this is beyond both our abilities and our hopes; yet we shall lay the foundations of it and recommend the superstructure to posterity." And it is now easy to see that the "universal and complete theory" which, with just forethought he pretended not to offer, could not have been framed or even attempted, until the sciences should have reached some measure of perfection, and out of their own lack of consistency and order clamored for law and system.

But now, at last, this need and preparedness for the great effort have arrived. If we examine, we shall find that each of the three works here projected as necessary to the completion of philosophy may at least be begun, if not pursued to a good degree of forwardness.

Have we not already the materials of the projected theory or doctrine of perfect knowledge? The map of the intellectual, like that of the physical globe, is almost complete, with scarcely a *terra incognita* to be explored, and philosophy might well reach her *ultima thule* in conjunction with geography. In other words, the exact limits of research may be said to have been ascertained and its several provinces defined. All the sciences at least have a name, are in various stages of progress, and fast coming into new and fruitful relations. Attempts even have been made to discover and impose upon them that system to which they are presumed to be tending. And if such forward minds have hitherto failed, it has been partly

because it is only through repeated failures we can pass to success, and also because they have not brought to their task that catholicity, candor, and patience which are the cardinal virtues of the philosophy they espouse, but have allowed some metaphysical or theological prejudice to hinder a just induction, and vainly tried to force upon science, as the old scholastics tried to force upon nature and Scripture, some partial and foregone theory. They have either exscinded the knowledge which has been revealed or the knowledge which has been discovered, and so announced pretended laws of scientific development which both history and reason falsify. But the very fact that efforts in this direction are put forth, and that even these crude, tentative hypotheses have yielded such brilliant results, augurs the full success that is at hand. After long ages of philosophical discipline and the accumulation of a mass of sciences extending to every class of phænomena, what now remains but that the inductive spirit should return upon its own intellectual product, in search of that sublime theory of cognition which is to be its crowning triumph, and at length set forth as the matured reason of the race and the destined apex of the pyramid of knowledge?

Have we not also, in large measure, the means of framing the projected organon of perfect knowledge? The cognitive mind, now grown experienced in all modes of research, has already garnered a store of principles and precedents wherewith to enter intelligently and authoritatively the more imperfect sciences, and preclude the waste and error and confusion which marked its infancy. Master-builders in the art of constructing science, one after another, have tried their hand upon the model, and given well-tested rules for the actual building. In inductive philosophy we have a line extending from Bacon to Comte, and in speculative philosophy, another from Kant to Hegel; while the very extreme into which the two latest thinkers have pushed their respective methods has already created the need of that third and last philosophy which shall mediate between them, and lead them back from their errant courses within the just and safe limits which they impose upon each other. Though our philosophical literature is as yet wanting in this latter department of sciential

thought, and there exists scarcely a treatise which can command the equal respect of both sects of disciples, those of reason and those of revelation, yet there is a craving among each after the laws of their latent affinity and the terms of their ultimate agreement. Now that so much of thorough drill has been infused among the different votaries of science, who doubts but that the logical spirit shall soon enter also their border feuds, and at length devise and publish those perfect canons of research by which the whole host of seekers for truth shall be marshalled as one mighty phalanx for the final career of eternal progression?

And may we not even begin to forecast the actual scheme and issue of perfect knowledge? Although that matured humanity which must result from matured intelligence has hitherto been aspired after only by elect minds, as but a vague ideal, and with faint presentiment; yet now, at least, the prospect grows clearer and surer, and thrills even the popular heart. By a few, at least, the vital connection between society and science is seen to insure the perfection of the one in that of the other. And as we feel that pulse of humanity which ever beats onward, and survey the wreck of systems in which fond visionaries have sought some airy tower of prospect, we can but devoutly hail, even if still afar off, the dawn of that era which the seers and saints and sages of all time have longed to see; and, entering with new joyfulness into their sacred prescience and prayer, proceed to labor as well as yearn for the great consummation.

Thus have we been brought to that fullness of time when Providence seems waiting to give the reins of the world to ripe reason, and is summoning us to enter with faith and hope upon the impending task.

For the scene of its inauguration, philanthropy selects the western hemisphere. A clime so strangely hidden for ages from mankind, would seem but the destined theatre of these later acts of history. And we have but to scan the map of the world to find that what could not elsewhere may here be practically initiated.

It could not originate in the eastern hemisphere. The two diverse civilizations—the oriental and occidental—represent-

ing the practical issues of the two diverse philosophies—the intuitional and the empirical—having proceeded apart for six thousand years on opposite sides of the globe, must meet as in completed circuit on some virgin soil and common ground, ere their joint mission can be accomplished. While still in their native seats, neither can thoroughly sift and appropriate the other. Both are there hampered by inveterate prejudices and contracted relations, and must continue to have something of extravagance in their development; the one towards mysticism, and the other towards scepticism; until thrown together on a new arena where they can find ampler scope and freer action.

It need not, indeed, be denied that in European civilization the eastern and western mind, the religious and scientific spirit have already for eighteen centuries been combined; but this very combination has at length only shown an exigency which it cannot meet, and materials which it cannot use upon its own soil. The rigid, social, national, and political distinctions of the Old World, to say nothing of its meagre physical location and structure, preclude that collection and fusion of all the elements of humanity, which is to be the work of the true cosmopolite philosophy.

But in this western hemisphere not only are such elements far more varied and abundant, but the facility for their recomposition is perfect. The American geography, genealogy, politics, and religion are simply unparalleled, either in ancient or modern civilization, and together form an aggregate of all that is peculiar to the civilizations of Europe, Asia, and Africa. Such a medley of climates, of races, of institutions, of creeds and theories, fusing under one political system, affords materials for a philosophy which cannot but be final; and, by projecting on a grander scale and with fuller conditions, all the time-worn issues of history, shows that here, if anywhere, the whole terrestrial problem is at length to be solved. Who that surveys this wide intellectual and social anarchy, and the swift and intense passions pervading it, but must feel that sooner or later, the plastic spirit of human opinion which, ever strengthening with the growth of reason, has wrought through all the past, disorganizing and reorganizing successive civiliza-

tions, must at last educe order from this chaos, and mould the ideal reign of truth and virtue?

Thus has Providence already opened and garnished the stage whereon to unfold that consummate system, which, as it is to be the flower of all thought and fruit of all climes and ages, can be called after no name, however worthy, and claimed by no people, however illustrious.

For the mode of its inauguration, philosophy ordains the academic curriculum. The educational system, as the primal fount of knowledge and influence in the social organism, affords the normal method of turning the grand ideal into a reality. And but a glance at the existing state of society will show that it alone is competent to the task.

There is an obvious unfitness in all other agencies. The professions and the press, being distributors rather than contributors of new ideas, and reflectors rather than manufacturers of opinion, as well as liable to be swayed by disturbing interests and passions, are too low down in the scale of social influence to reach the springs of existing evils. A movement which is to cure them by harmonizing science and theology, must originate beyond the sphere of popular prejudice, in that quiet circle of thinkers and scholars where truth is prized for her own sake, and sought with the zeal of the votary. The tactics and the drill of this warfare are not to be learned amid the smoke of battle, by the mere tyros and bigots who are in such haste to practice them, but must be brought thither by those who have been schooled into philosophic tastes and habits.

This at least, it may be safely affirmed, is the judgment of intelligent conservatives, who are in the field and acquainted with its wants. There is a growing feeling throughout the educated classes that the crisis has become too grave to be continued as a mere topic of periodical review or theme of professional declamation. What pastor, lawyer, or physician, if he has the time or taste, is competent to grapple with the great question in any of its branches? He encounters at once the suspicion of having got beyond his province, and is sure of the contempt of one or both parties, if only because of his supposed unfitness and prejudice. The work has plainly

reached the importance of a special cause, calling for special qualifications, and the devising of new appliances, more fixed and organic than any now in use.

It should not indeed be overlooked, that this craving has already been long expressing itself in a rich and growing literature, partly in the interest of science, and partly in the interest of theology, and sometimes by the institution of prize-essays and lectureships, which are directly aimed at the work of their conciliation; but whatever success has hitherto attended such scattered and irregular efforts only lights the way to others that may be more direct, lasting, and effective.

It is by means of academic training alone, that the whole social organism can be reached and cured of its present vicious and morbid action. The true university is its brain, receiving from professorships and distributing through the professions ideas that rule the masses; and according as it is sophisticated or purified will the whole body be depraved or ennobled. In other words, we have only to recur to the social evils described as the issue of the great schism in modern philosophy, to see that they can only be met educationally, by special courses of study and instruction, at the seats of culture where they stealthily and unwittingly originate and are often unconsciously harbored.

It is there that we must seek the unity of science. She gathers thither her votaries to endow them with her riches, and assign them their tasks, and so long as she presents but a divided front and ranges them in opposite ranks, must the breach between them be only widened; but in proportion as both the rational and the revealed sciences are studied in their actual connections, and brought into some logical relationship; as fast as the former are made to illustrate the character, policy, and purposes of the God of revelation and the latter are established in harmony with all the discoveries of reason, will they be found to be but branches from one root of knowledge, living and growing in the truth.

It is there, also, we must seek the catholicity of learning and the communion of scholars. From thence the youthful mind, while forming its intellectual habits, and ere it has been narrowed by professional prejudices, receives its life-long bias;

and only by diverting it, from its present tendencies toward either skepticism or bigotry, can the whole educated class be imbued with a spirit of large and generous culture.

And it is there, too, we must seek a salutary influence upon all the great interests of religion, politics and art. Let the salt of truth be cast into these living fountains, and the stream of intellectual and moral corruption will be cleansed; the evils of the church, the state, and the life will be cured; and a current of new and vitalizing ideas poured throughout the whole social body. Though now all surrounding civilization seems based in error and ignorance and swayed by conflicting opinions and prejudices, still we need not fear but that the spirit of truth, training and marshalling her votaries in such sequestered haunts of culture, shall yet lead them forth as a disciplined host, even into the thick of this great conflict, and there proclaim her destined rule of order, law, and love.

It may serve to give more definiteness and feasibility to these views if we here insert a scheme of academic studies, based upon the foregoing project and arranged with reference to the existing and prospective state of the sciences.

PART I.—SCIENCE OF THE SCIENCES.

1. EXPURGATION OF THE SCIENCES.

Misconceptions as to the origin, value, and dignity of science.

Of science as the function of the social or collective mind.

Of science as distinguished from ordinary or popular knowledge.

Of science as distinguished from art.

Of science as distinguished from philosophy.

Its essential unity amid artificial divisions.

Its steady progress through human vicissitudes and adverse influences.

Various popular, professional, and philosophical prejudices, which now hinder the unity and growth of the sciences: their source and remedy.

Various intellectual and moral qualifications for pursuing the sciences, demanded by their present state.

Conditions and resources of a science of the sciences.

2. SURVEY OF THE SCIENCES.

German, French, and English classifications or systems of the sciences: their merits and defects.

Principles of the true system: 1st That they should be arranged according to the actual order of phenomena as co-existent in space, the celestial in connection with the terrestrial mechanics, chemistry, organics, ethics, and politics. 2d. That they should be combined according to the actual order of pheno-

mena as successive in time, the material preceding the spiritual, in a series rising from the simplest physical facts to the most complex psychical facts.

By still farther separating them into abstract and concrete groups, we get the following map of the sciences, with its bounded provinces and known and unknown regions:

	Abstract Sciences.	*Concrete Sciences.*	
Celestial and Terrestrial.	Religious.	Theology.	Psychical.
	Social.	Sociology.	
	Individual.	Psychology.	
	Organical.	Anthropology.	Physical.
	Chemical.	Geology.	
	Mechanical.	Astronomy.	

Characteristics of psychical as distinguished from physical science.

Characteristics of metaphysical as distinguished from empirical science.

Relative advancement of the sciences.

Brief summary of their results: in the expansion of the intellect, in the accumulation of truth, and in new accessions of human power, dignity, and happiness.

Their need and readiness for some logical organization and more systematic culture.

3. THEORY OF THE SCIENCES, OR DOCTRINE OF COGNITION.

(1) Of the cognitive, or the means of cognition.

False theories, which would reject either reason or revelation, or would derange their normal relations.

The true theory, that of their gradual coincidence and ultimate harmony.

Foundation for this theory in both the nature and the history of the human intellect.

Its accuracy and fitness.

(2) Of the cognizable, or the material of cognition.

False theories, which would ignore either the causes or the laws of phenomena.

The true theory, that which would be cognizant of both in their actual coexistences and successions, and claim as the ideal domain of science the whole aggregate of worlds throughout all ages.

Foundation for this theory in both the structure and the development of the universe.

Its completeness and grandeur.

(3) Of the cognitive in action upon the cognizable, or the process of cognition.

False theories, which would either confine reason to terrestrial and material phenomena, or confine revelation to spiritual and celestial phenomena.

The true theory, that which would combine both means of cognition in all fields of cognition as involving a joint process of finite and infinite intelligence throughout immensity and eternity, toward the goal of omniscience.

Foundation for this theory in the relations of finite and Infinite mind, and in the history of the human sciences.

Procession of the sciences in correspondence with the procession of phænomena, as involving an endless review of the creation, by the creature, for the glory of the Creator.

Ideal perfectibility of knowledge as contrasted with its actual imperfection.

Means and motives for ever striving after perfect knowledge.

PART II.—ART OF THE SCIENCES.

Need of precepts for pursuing and perfecting the sciences, with a view to their systematic culture.

1. INDUCTIVE LOGIC, or Organon of Empirical Science.
2. DEDUCTIVE LOGIC, or Organon of Metaphysical Science.
3. SYNTHETIC LOGIC, or Organon of Perfectible Science.

The latter embracing the following scheme of rules for harmonizing the rational and revealed bodies of knowledge:

THE NORMAL STATE OF THE SCIENCES.

1. In each science reason and revelation are complemental factors of knowledge, the former discovering what the latter has not revealed, and the latter revealing what the former cannot discover.

2. In the ascending scale of the sciences the province of reason contracts as that of revelation expands, with the growing complexity, obscurity, and human importance of the sciences themselves.

3. The joint action of reason and revelation throughout the sciences logically involves the perfectibility of knowledge or the indefinite expansion of science toward omniscience.

THE EXISTING STATE OF THE SCIENCES.

1. Hypotheses and dogmas are to be formed by the scientist and religionist independently, each in his own province, and by his own methods.

2. Dogmas within the province of the scientist must be tested in the same manner as his own hypotheses; and hypotheses within the province of the religionist, in the same manner as his own dogmas.

3. Conflicting hypotheses and dogmas may be provisionally adjusted by exhibiting the problem of opinion, according as reason or revelation predominates in the normal scale of the sciences.

THE PROSPECTIVE STATE OF THE SCIENCES.

1. In the progress of the sciences, conflicting hypotheses and dogmas, by their own attritions and mutual corrections, pass into the theories and doctrines accepted by both parties.

2. This gradual conversion of the hypothetical and dogmatical into the scientific, proceeds in the order of the sciences, from one set of facts to another, from the simple to the complex, from the lower to the higher, from the physical through the psychical sciences.

3. The historical goal of the whole scientific process, ever to be approached even if never attained, is the absorption of positive in absolute science or perfect knowledge.

The ideal of a full equipment of the sciences for their work of endless progression toward perfect knowledge.

Prospect of its realization.

PART III.—SCIENCE OF THE ARTS.

Practical issue of the sciences in their correspondent arts.

This growth of the arts out of the sciences, from having been spontaneous and irregular, may become more and more logical and systematic.

Logical partition of the arts to be adjusted to that of the sciences.

1. SCIENCE OF THE MATERIAL ARTS, or principles which regulate the rational control of man over mechanical and chemical phenomena in both the terrestrial and celestial spheres of action.

2. SCIENCE OF THE MORAL ARTS, or principles which regulate the rational control of man over individual and social phenomena in both the terrestrial and celestial spheres of action.

3. SCIENCE OF THE RELIGIOUS ARTS, or principles which regulate the rational control of man, in co-operation with God, over both material and spiritual phenomena.

Procession of the arts from and with the sciences as involving the progressive dominion of the creature over the creation, and his participation in the glory of the Creator.

Ideal perfectibility of the arts as contrasted with their actual imperfection.

The perfection of terrestrial sciences and arts, both material and spiritual, as involving a union of the human with the Divine mind and will in the knowledge and control of all terrestrial phenomena.

The perfection of celestial sciences and arts, both spiritual and material, as involving the endless return, through all worlds and ages, of the finite into the Infinite Reason and effort after the one perfect religion or *religature* of the creature to the Creator, through and by means of the creation.

Aims of such a course of studies: 1st. To preserve throughout the scale of the sciences the vital connection of the rational with the revealed material of knowledge and the logical correlations between the human and the divine factors of knowledge. 2d. To combine in each science all that is established as discovered with all that is established as revealed, and as to all that is still hypothetical and dogmatic, to show the problem of opinion. 3d. To connect logically the ascertained portions of one science with those of another, and problematically their theoretical portions. 4th. To display with the series of the sciences their corresponding series of arts as ever tending to enhance the Divine glory and human welfare. And lastly, to organize, by this means, that proximate system of sciences, arts, and societies, upon which to project, in endless perspective, the ultimate system.

The practical objection may here be raised that an academic field, so wide and rich, would demand an amount of research and erudition in the teacher, and a degree of maturity and scholarship in the pupil, which are quite impossible.

To the former part of the objection it is enough to reply: 1st. That the aim need not be to traverse the two great divisions of knowledge throughout their whole extent, but merely

that intersected portion of them where they are involved in a kind of border warfare. 2d. That into this common field it would be needful to enter only with a resumé of established truths and principles, rather than with special researches and acquisitions. 3d. That to master the abstract part of any of the sciences, what may be termed their philosophy or logic, does not require learning so much as thought and study. 4th. That those very faculties of abstraction, generalization, and comparison which would qualify for such a task, would almost disqualify for any other, and be hindered rather than stimulated by minute investigations. There are, moreover, abundant helps to the work to be found in standard treatises authoritative in both schools, in compends of their several attainments, and in a current literature, teeming with the richest and most varied contributions.

To the latter part of the objection it may be replied: 1st. That it enters into the scope of all academic life to increase as well as diffuse the existing stock of knowledge. 2d. That in fulfilling this latter aim, there is always a vast amount of instruction which is simply stored rather than at once digested in the mind of the student. 3d. The efficiency of such teaching would, after all, depend upon the stage in the curriculum at which it should be introduced, and the personal enthusiasm with which on both sides it is conducted.

We are thus led next to inquire as to the particular form which such academic training should assume, or the best method of incorporating it in existing systems of education.

And here the general principle is obvious, that it belongs to the more advanced stages of pupilage, and should accompany or follow special training in the two departments it aims to unite. It could only, in order to be effective, come after a gymnastic or subgraduate course, and would defeat its own aim if addressed to immature and unfurnished minds. According to the theory of the true university, it would be the proper auxiliary or complement of the three faculties of law, medicine, and theology, and might appear among them simply as a philosophical professorship, designed to take the results of other professorships, and, after recombining them, transmit them through the professions into the sphere of practice.

Such a device would not only act as a fixed, aggregating centre of those border topics by which the professions are logically joined together, fostering the commerce of ideas among them, though without hindering that division of labor in which they thrive, but it would also, by its bearing upon all contemporary intellectual movements, remain as a watch tower and bulwark of truth on the field of error.

If the theory seem somewhat visionary as applied to our American system, this may only serve to show at once our danger and remedy. There could not, in fact, be more striking proof of our need, motive, and opportunity for the great reconciliation than is yielded by the history and present state of the academic curriculum. That schism, which in the European universities has issued in no outward dissociation of the band of scholars, has spread through our whole scheme of education as a visible breach, until at last both philosophy and theology seem to have lost their normal rank and power, and the very words are turned by their respective followers against each other with something of suspicion. We have two classes of institutions—the secular and the sacred, the civil and the ecclesiastical; and in both the work of disruption has been going forward. Theology has been driven from the former by the gradual ascendency of the classics and mathematics over the old metaphysics with which it was once associated; and philosophy has been driven from the latter by the degradation of the study of divinity into a mere professional and sectarian training of the clergy.

And hence the first question to be met in attempting their educational fusion is as to which party the initiative should be given; whether the movement should come from the theological or from the philosophical side, in the interest of religion or of science, as an ecclesiastical or as a catholic effort. The whole effect of such academic study, will plainly be modified according as one or the other of these points of departure is taken.

In a purely theological course, it would appear as a branch of apologetics or polemics; and the aim would be not merely to uphold the general authority of Scripture, but also of some particular creed or confession drawn from Scripture, in its con-

tact and conflict with the human sciences. And this, chiefly as a kind of armor and drill for the battle with heresy and infidelity. In a purely philosophical course, it would appear as a branch of disinterested research; and the aim would be, ignoring all creeds and sects, and viewing the revealed in connection with the rational sciences, to define and defend the prerogatives of each in its own domain, and to exhibit their joint product under a scientific rather than a practical aspect, and in its due place and connections, in the general body of learning.

In favor of the latter as compared with the former, several reasons may be urged.

In the first place, it is the more natural and reasonable method. A work of mediation involves mutual concession; and if this great movement must be initiated at either extreme, it has a clear right to come from the scientific side, where it originated, and should be met and welcomed. It is in fact a concession which we not only can afford to make but must make, that revealed truths are as susceptible as natural truths of rational support and confirmation, and may also be safely taught without regard to their practical applications, or to the transcendent interests they involve, and in entire freedom from all prejudice, as pure matters of abstract rather than of applied science. If the great fundamental tenet of inspiration cannot base itself in scientific discovery, but is doomed to be steadily undermined, then the whole superstructure of the biblical sciences must crumble with it into ruins as mere superstition and bigotry. While we are unwilling that savants should force their theories upon us as creeds, we must permit them to treat out creeds as theories until found consistent with science. We need not fear, that practically and personally the one party will be any the less moral, religious, and orthodox, or the other any the less learned, humane, and philosophical, on account of such a problematical state of their relations.

So long, indeed, as theology, in a course of education, is forced into any warlike bearing, offensive or defensive, apologetic or polemic, even her own interests may be damaged; but when she is allowed her due place among the sciences,

as alike entering with them all into the training of an accomplished scholar, and it is made the recognized vocation of both teacher and pupil to address themselves to her lessons with philosophic candor and conscientious enthusiasm, truth will at least be in the way of gaining the homage of reason, and from the first have the vantage over error.

In the second place, it would reach a larger and more varied mass of the forming mind of society. Instead of being confined to one calling, it would include candidates for all the three learned professions, who, viewed respectively as votaries of physical, metaphysical, and theological science, are the real parties first interested in the reconciliation, and by their presence together in the same relations might yield a wholesome stimulus and check upon both professor and student.

In the third place, it would be preventive, rather than simply remedial, as to existing social perils. However desirable it may be to equip the Church with new apologetic appliances in view of modern scientific skepticism, yet these after all would not reach the evil at its hidden springs. It has its origin in the very methods, habits, and acquirements of science, and by means of these alone can be mastered and corrected.

In the fourth place, it would have the high character and even the impressive appearance of an effort to follow the revolted sciences into their own haunts of estrangement and error and win them back again by their own logic and laws. It would be leading forth the young and eager thought of the time on a new mission of truth and love, rather than in the old and crooked ways of prejudice and passion. What are most of the existing treatises or even professorships put forth in the interest of theology, as viewed by her foes, but weak confessions that she is on the defensive, and base signals of defeat? It is not by polemics, apologies, or evidences, that she will ever resume her rightful dominion in the seats of learning. It is not by any sacred sophistry that she is to convince the disciples of reason, or with mere dogmatic assertion that she can reclaim the homage of philosophy. Science, like nature, can only be controlled through a knowledge of her laws. These once found and imposed, she will prove no way-

ward seeker of truth, but as her Eastern sages once read a gospel in the stars, will come by her own researches to the manifested God, and worship Him with fair and costly art.

But from whichever side, or at whatever point of the academic system, the work of affiliation shall proceed, as it advances it cannot but be met with a wide and hearty welcome. He has but illy scanned the present state of learning who takes the wordy strife of mere bigots and savants as a fair reflection of the general mind upon the question. There runs through the catholic thought of the age, however seldom expressed, a deep undertone of sadness and misgiving rather than of mutual anger and defiance. True philosophy takes no delight in this sore feud, which has rent the body of her disciples in twain, but in their midst still secretly yearns for a just reconciliation. And when once any movement shall have gone forth among them which shall seem to command them with a voice of reason and love, it must sooner or later be hailed with joy, however obscure and feeble may have been its beginnings.

Thus has Providence prepared the soil, as well as disclosed the field, and sifted the seed for a mighty harvest of truth, in which we may be the sowers and the latest posterity the reapers. A great work may at least be commenced by us: the time is at hand; the scene is ready; and the mode is obvious. In these last days and at these ends of the earth, we have the means of not merely projecting but also of inaugurating that scheme of perfect knowledge through which the dissevered hosts of philosophy are to be thoroughly organized, and at length science matured, art perfected, society renewed, and the whole world filled with a glory of which it is not possible now to conceive.

Here let us rest in this difficult ascent of thought which we have climbed. Though the way may have seemed uncertain and tedious, yet the prospect gained is sure. That which can now only be called the ultimate philosophy may rise under another name and in other ways; but whenever, wherever, and however inaugurated it is itself inevitable. Every species

of pledge, the word of God, the law of facts, and the voice of reason combine to proclaim it. It is that perfect system of knowledge and of society which both logically and providentially results from the whole previous development of humanity. It is the goal of history, seen with the eyes of prophecy and philosophy, and yearned after by the heart of philanthropy. It is the millennium projected upon rational sequence as well as divine decree; and could it fail to come to pass, it would not simply be as if a great human hope had perished, but as if the divine reason had falsified its own premises, laid through all the past, and left the problem of the world unsolved. Astronomers tell us that were this material globe to reel from its orbit, it could only be by a miracle, suspending the very laws of mathematics; but how much less conceivable that the moral world should ever recoil in mid-progress and the whole work of time become a meaningless fragment! The flower of the planetary life, rooted in extinct marvels, and blooming through long ages of sin and sorrow, will not thus be blighted at its budding. The fairest ideal that lives in divine and human fancy will not thus be turned to naught.

Behold, then, at one glance, the issue to which we are come. The summary want of the age, is that last philosophy into which shall have been sifted all other philosophy, which shall be at once catholic and eclectic, which shall be the joint growth and fruit of reason and faith, and which shall shed forth, through every walk of research, the blended light of discovery and revelation; a philosophy which shall be no crude aggregate of decaying systems and doctrines, but their distilled issue and living effect, and which shall not have sprung, full born from any one mind or people, but mature as the common work and reward of all; a philosophy which, proceeding upon the unity of truth, shall establish the harmony of knowledge through the intelligent concurrence of the human with the divine intellect, and the rational subjection of the finite to the Infinite reason; a philosophy, too, which shall be as beneficent as it is sacred, which in the act of healing the schisms of truth, shall also heal the sects of the school, of the church, and of the state, and while regenerating human

art, both material and moral, shall at length regenerate human society; a philosophy, in a word, which shall be the means of subjecting the earth to man and man to God, by grouping the sciences, with their fruits and trophies, at the feet of Omniscience, and there converging and displaying all laws and causes in God, the cause of causes and of laws, of whom are all things and in whom all things consist; to whom alone be glory.

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

IN THE ORDER OF THEIR TREATMENT.

INTRODUCTION.

THE ACADEMIC STUDY OF CHRISTIAN SCIENCE.

The province and limits of Christian science, 4–6: its topics, 7–9. Religion and Science related logically, historically and practically, 9–13: their relations extensive, complicated and vital, 13–15: their reconciliation feasible and inevitable, 15–17. Importance of their harmony to science, to religion and to philosophy, 17–19. The study of Christian science, 20: its intellectual and moral value, 21–23.

PART I.—THE PHILOSOPHICAL PARTIES AS TO THE RELATIONS BETWEEN SCIENCE AND RELIGION.

CHAPTER I.

EARLY CONFLICTS AND ALLIANCES BETWEEN SCIENCE AND RELIGION.

The causes of their present disturbed relations historically traced from the dawn of Greek philosophy to the Reformation, 27–51.

THE PRE-CHRISTIAN AGE OF PAGAN SCIENCE.

Conflicts of philosophy and mythology. Proto-martyrs of science and Prototypes of infidelity, 29, 30.

THE POST-CHRISTIAN AGE OF PAGAN SCIENCE.

Conflicts of Christianity and philosophy. Christian converts and church fathers who assailed philosophy. . Pagan writers and philosophers who assailed Christianity, 31, 32.

THE PATRISTIC AGE OF CHRISTIAN SCIENCE.

Alliance of theology and philosophy. Greek and Latin fathers who espoused Platonism and Aristotelianism, and corrupted the sciences of astronomy, geology and geography, 33, 34. Blended Pagan and Christian culture, 35, 36.

THE SCHOLASTIC AGE OF CHRISTIAN SCIENCE.

Predominance of theology: leading scholastic theologians: scholastic Christian culture, 36–38. Subjugation of philosophy: scholastic logicians, metaphysicians and physicists who suffered persecution: corrupted state of the sciences, 38–40.

THE REFORMING AGE OF CHRISTIAN SCIENCE.

The assault of theology: reforming scholastics and philosophers who were assailed: conflicts in geography and astronomy: final retreat of theology, 41–44. The revolt of philosophy: sceptical scholastics, philosophers, scientists, deists: final attack of philosophy, 45–48. The present decisive conflict between religion and science: its field, weapons and issues, 49–51.

CHAPTER II.

MODERN ANTAGONISM BETWEEN SCIENCE AND RELIGION.

The four philosophical parties as to the question. Definition of the Extremists, both scientific and religious, as infidels and apologists; and their conflicts traced in the different sciences from one country to another during the last three centuries, 52–94.

THE CONFLICT IN ASTRONOMY.

Italian, English, French and German infidels who have assailed revealed doctrines of creation, incarnation and atonement with astronomical weapons, and leading apologists in the same countries who have defended the false Ptolemaic astronomy with supposed biblical weapons, 56–62.

THE CONFLICT IN GEOLOGY.

Infidel geologists in Italy, England, France and Germany who have assailed the Mosaic cosmogony, and Christian apologists in the same countries who have defended a false biblical geology, 62–66.

THE CONFLICT IN ANTHROPOLOGY.

Recent infidel assaults in Europe and America upon the creation, unity and divine image of mankind, and weak apologetic defences of existing dogmas in reference to the same questions, 67–69.

THE CONFLICT IN PSYCHOLOGY.

Italian, English, French and German infidels who have assailed the spirituality, responsibility and immortality of the soul with Aristotelianism, empiricism, sensualism and materialism, 69–72. Apologists in the same countries, who have defended such tenets with Platonism, idealism, dualism, monadism and spiritualism, 72–76.

THE CONFLICT IN SOCIOLOGY.

Italian statesmen, English historians, French socialists, German philosophers of history, who have assailed the doctrine of Providence, the Church and the millennium. Italian churchmen, French theocrats, English episcopalians and presbyterians, and German ecclesiastical historians who have defended the same doctrines, 76–81.

THE CONFLICT IN THEOLOGY.

Italian naturalists, English deists, French atheists, German pantheists and American religionists who have assailed the being, character and government of God, and the distinctive doctrines of Christianity. Italian, English, French and German theists and divines who have defended natural and revealed religion, 82–87.

THE CONFLICT IN PHILOSOPHY.

Antagonistic efforts of rationalists and mystics to supplant reason or revelation in Italy, England, France, Germany during the last three centuries, 88–91.

THE RESULTS IN CIVILIZATION.

Disastrous social and political convulsions attending modern impiety and fanaticism in different European countries, 92, 93.

Refutation of the opinion that there is any real antagonism between true science and true religion. The antagonism apparent rather than real, temporary rather than permanent, and in some respects more salutary than hurtful, 93, 94.

CHAPTER III.

MODERN INDIFFERENTISM BETWEEN SCIENCE AND RELIGION.

Definition of the party of indifferentists, both scientific and religious, as sciolists and dogmatists. Origin of modern indifferentism. The schism traced in the physical sciences, in the psychical sciences, in the metaphysical sciences, and in philosophy, to its practical effects in civilization, 95–132.

THE SCHISM IN ASTRONOMY.

Renunciation of the biblical astronomy as of no scientific value by certain speculative astronomers and physicists, 98-100.

Repudiation of the whole scientific astronomy as of no Scriptural warrant or dogmatic interest by certain divines and commentators, 98–100.

THE SCHISM IN GEOLOGY.

Sciolists who have ignored or repudiated the biblical geology as of no scientific value, 100–102.

Dogmatists who have rejected or slighted the scientific geology as of no Scriptural significance, 102, 103.

THE SCHISM IN ANTHROPOLOGY.

Sciolists, who ignore or reject the biblical anthropology as of no scientific import, 103, 104.

Modern divines who are assailing the new scientific anthropology as inconsistent with the Scriptures, 105, 106.

THE SCHISM IN PSYCHOLOGY.

Modern thinkers who ignore or reject the whole biblical psychology, 107, 108.

Modern divines who forego or depreciate the scientific psychology as of no Scriptural importance, 108, 109.

THE SCHISM IN SOCIOLOGY.

Sciolists who would exclude the biblical doctrines of Providence, the Church and the Millennium as of no value in the social sciences, 109, 110.

Dogmatists who forego all social science in their treatment of ecclesiastical questions, 110, 111.

THE SCHISM IN THEOLOGY.

New school of speculative religionists who would exclude all revealed theology as unscientific, 111–113.

Dogmatic divines who wholly ignore or neglect the new scientific theology as of no Scriptural warrant or doctrinal interest, 113, 114.

THE SCHISM IN METAPHYSICS.

Modern metaphysicians and scientists who ignore the Scriptures as authority on metaphysical questions, 114, 115.

Modern theologians who neglect or reject the results of recent metaphysical thought, 116.

THE RUPTURE IN PHILOSOPHY.

Modern philosophers and scientists who ignore or reject revelation as a source of knowledge: French positivists, English agnostics, 117, 118.

Modern divines who are ignorant or indifferent as to all scientific or philosophical knowledge: Theoretical and practical forms of this unphilosophical faith, 119, 120.

THE BREACH IN CIVILIZATION.

Schismatic Secular Culture.—Alienation of civilization from Christianity since the Reformation, growth of a purely worldly culture, and gradual secularization of literature, of art, of science, of politics, and of religion, 121–124.

Schismatic Religious Culture.—Alienation of Christianity from civilization, growth of a purely religious culture, and gradual abnegation of literature, of art, of science, of politics, and of the earthly side of religion, 124–128. Refutation of the opinion that there is any real indifferentism between true science and true religion: such indifferentism involves a dismemberment of knowledge, extends through all the sciences, and is fraught with the greatest evils in the realms of philosophy, in the educational system, and in all the practical spheres of civilization, 128–132.

CHAPTER IV.

MODERN ECLECTICISM BETWEEN SCIENCE AND RELIGION.

Definition of the party of impatients, both scientific and religious, as eclectics who seek to blend hypotheses and dogmas prematurely and illogically: with examples of such eclecticism in the various sciences, in philosophy and in civilization, 133–209.

ECLECTICISM IN ASTRONOMY.

The Ptolemaic and Copernican systems of the Biblical heavens: crude theistic arguments from celestial physics. Devotional astronomy, 136, 137. Advocates of the nebular hypothesis who have blended it with the Scripture history of creation: advocates of the plurality of inhabited worlds who have blended it with the Scripture doctrine of angels, redemption and incarnation, 138–145. Attempted scientific explanations of the astronomical miracles of the Arrest of the Sun, the Dial of Ahaz, the Star in the East, and the predicted Renewal of the Heavens, 145–149.

ECLECTICISM IN GEOLOGY.

The traditional geography and terrestrial physics as incorporated with the Scriptures. Crude physico-theology, Devotional physics, Biblical physics, Theosophic interpreters of Genesis, 149–153. Cosmogonists who have combined the hypothesis of a chaos with the doctrine of Satanic agency: Harmonists who have sought—(1) to compress the geological periods in creative days of twenty-four hours, (2) to insert them between a primitive creation and six literal days of a new creation, (3) to expand the six days into long creative eras corresponding to the geological periods, (4) to treat both the Mosaic days and the geological

periods as ideal moments or phases of the creative activity, 154–161. Sacred Theories of the Earth: Scientific explanations of the geological miracles, the Deluge, the Final Conflagration, and predicted Renovation of the Earth, 161–164.

ECLECTICISM IN ANTHROPOLOGY.

The traditional ethnography and archæology as derived from the Scriptures. Crude theistic arguments. A Bible Anthropology, 165. Creationists who have identified their successive genera and species as abrupt creations: Evolutionists who are beginning to admit the development hypothesis into the inorganic, the vegetal, the animal, and the human kingdoms, 166–169. Ethnologists who refer all human races to one progenitor, Adam, or take Adam as the ancestor of the Caucasian race and the moral, federal representative of other indigenous races, 169, 170. Arahæologists who include all monuments and traditions within six thousand years, or expand the received biblical theology indefinitely, so as to include long extinct human and angelic civilizations, 171, 172. Philologists who are in like manner divided as to the Scripture doctrine of languages, 173, 174. Attempted scientific verifications of such miracles as the Ark of Noah, the Tower of Babel, the divine humanity of the Second Adam, and the predicted innocence of the animal and human creation in a restored paradise, 174, 175.

ECLECTICISM IN PSYCHOLOGY.

The mental sciences as traditionally based in the Scriptures. Faulty theistic proofs from psychology, 176, 177. Advocates of pre-existence of souls, creationists and traducianists who have sought a biblical basis for their opinions, 178, 179. Opposite schools of libertarians and necessitarians in regard to the doctrines of predestination, regeneration and responsibility, 179, 180. Opposite ethical schools of utilitarians and ascetics in regard to the doctrine of Christian virtue, 180, 182. Immortalists who have held that the soul becomes immediately holy in the intermediate state, or that it is susceptible of increasing happiness and holiness, or that it is at once absorbed and lost in the divine consciousness: mortalists who have held that the soul sleeps unconsciously in the intermediate state, or that it is wholly extinguished with the body till the resurrection, 182–187. Speculative psychologists and divines who have held that the spiritual body is immediately developed out of the present organism, or that it will hereafter be resuscitated with the very same material substance as now, or reorganized from different substance with the same structure, or simply express the same character through different matter and even a different form, 187–190. Scientific verification of the psychical miracles, the gifts of prophecy and of tongues, demoniac possessions, and angelic ministry, 191.

ECLECTICISM IN SOCIOLOGY.

The social sciences as mere biblical and ecclesiastical topics. Rival schools of Christian politic, 192. Legitimists who have based divine right upon Scripture: historians who have referred universal history to providential economics: statesmen and churchmen who have advocated the moral corruptibility of society, 193. Civilians and divines, who have advocated free principles, the progress of society, under natural laws, in virtue and religion, and the probability of a future perfected Christian State, 194. Scientific verification of such miracles as the Temptation of Adam and of Christ, the conflict of humanity with evil angels, the sympathy of good angels, and their appearance in the judgment of the world, 195.

ECLECTICISM IN THEOLOGY.

The natural, metaphysical and comparative theologies as blended with the revealed. Christian philosophy of religion, 196. Monism and dualism creationism and evolutionism, pessimism and optimism, as maintained by recent religious thinkers, 196–198.

ECLECTIC RELIGIOUS PHILOSOPHY.

Mystical philosophers who have prematurely sought to harmonize reason and revelation. Eclectic philosophies of science and religion, 200. Various popular attempts of an apologetic nature, 201, 202.

CRUDE RELIGIOUS CULTURE.

Revival of mediæval forms of Christian culture. Attempted re-consecration of literature, of art, of politics, and of religion, 203–206.

Refutation of the opinion that science and religion are fully and immediately reconcilable in their present stage of development: such eclecticism is specious and partial, illogical and unscientific, narrow and premature, and practically vague and visionary, 207–209.

CHAPTER V.

MODERN SCEPTICISM BETWEEN SCIENCE AND RELIGION.

Definition of the party of despondents or sceptics, both scientific and religious, and examples of their disparaging estimate of the revealed portions of knowledge in the different sciences, in philosophy, and in civilization, 209–237.

SCEPTICISM IN ASTRONOMY.

Writers who have expressed sceptical doubts as to the theistic argument of astronomy, and as to the moral design of the heavenly worlds, 214, 215. Rationalistic critics who have explained away the astronomical miracles, the Stoppage of the Sun, the Star in the East, and the Final Conflagration, 215, 216.

SCEPTICISM IN GEOLOGY.

Sceptical objections to the religious lessons of terrestrial physics, and to the accordance of geology with Genesis, 217. Rationalistic explanations of various geological miracles of the Old and New Testaments—the Deluge, the Destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, Stilling of the Tempest, the prodigies at the Crucifixion, etc., 218.

SCEPTICISM IN ANTHROPOLOGY.

Doubts as to the teleological argument in animate nature, and as to the proof of the divine benevolence, 219. Rationalists who have disparaged the literal story of the creation and fall of Adam, 220. Naturalistic explanations of various miracles, such as the confusion of tongues at Babel, the fusion at Pentecost, the incarnation, transfiguration and ascension of Christ, 220, 221.

SCEPTICISM IN PSYCHOLOGY.

Writers who have depreciated the theistic proofs of the mental sciences, 222. Modern divines who have disparaged the traditional doctrines of grace, 223, Rationalistic explanations of the psychical miracles, of inspiration, conversion. angelic visitation, 223, 224.

SCEPTICISM IN SOCIOLOGY.

Difficulties of the theistic argument in the social sciences and in history, 224, 225. Rationalistic re-statements of the doctrine of the church, 225. Scientific scepticism as to the political miracles of famine, war, Satanic influence, the Final Judgment, 226.

SCEPTICISM IN THEOLOGY.

Disparaging criticism of all the traditional theistic arguments, and new difficulties in comparative theology, 226, 227. Modern divines who have speculated away the peculiar doctrines of revealed theology, 227, 228. Rationalistic, Naturalistic, and Mythological critics who have deprived Christianity of its miraculous insignia, 228, 229.

SCEPTICAL RELIGIOUS PHILOSOPHY.

Religious sceptics who have been ready to abandon reason for the sake of revelation, or revelation for the sake of reason, 229–231. Various popular writers who favor such scepticism, 231, 232. Dispiriting effects of such scepticism, 232, 233.

EFFETE RELIGIOUS CULTURE.

Supposed signs of decay in modern civilization: despair of any regeneration of literature, or of art, or of politics, or of religion, 234–237.

Concluding argument from the previous survey: Refutation of the opinion that science or religion are essentially contradictory and wholly irreconcilable at any future stage of development: such scepticism is weak and ignoble, narrow and unfounded: it overlooks past progress and mistakes the present social exigency: the more hopeful view is in keeping with the analogies of prophecy and of history, with the organism of society and with the interests of religion and science, 237–242.

PART II.—THE PHILOSOPHICAL THEORY OF THE HARMONY OF SCIENCE AND RELIGION.

CHAPTER I.

THE UMPIRAGE OF PHILOSOPHY BETWEEN SCIENCE AND RELIGION.

The need of some logical conciliation as inferred from a survey of the scientific hypotheses and religious dogmas which are pitted against each other in the different sciences, and the province of philosophy in regard to such unsolved problems, 245–286.

UNSOLVED PROBLEMS IN THE PHYSICAL SCIENCES.

In astronomy, the hypothesis of primitive evolution of nebulæ and the dogma of instantaneous creation of the heavens: plurality of worlds and hierarchy of angels: ultimate dissolution of planets and miraculous renewal of the heavens, 249–252. In geology, secular formation of strata and successive creations: refrigeration of the globe and miraculous renewal by fire: periodic changes of climate and species and judgments of the deluge and conflagration, 252–254. In anthropology, development of animal into human species and creation of Adam in the divine image: gradual rise of races, languages and arts, and the miraculous confusion and dispersion at Babel: physical decline of the future human race and predicted renewal of man with the earth, 254–258.

UNSOLVED PROBLEMS IN THE PHYSICAL SCIENCES.

In psychology, sociology and theology,—the production and dissolution of mind and the creation and regeneration of the soul: natural growth and decay of societies and supernatural career of the Church: evolution of natural religions and predicted triumph of revealed religion, 258, 259. In the metaphysical sciences,—phenomenal nature of mind and matter, and pre-ordained harmony of soul and body: evolution of the absolute reason or will and creation by the Father through the Son: abolition of theology by science and rectification of science by revelation: ultimate nescience and the beatific vision and new apocalypse, 259, 260. Such problems are neither exclusively scientific nor exclusively religious, but strictly philosophical questions, 261, 262. Extension of Professor Tyndall's illustration of the psychical class of problems: renewed argument of Bishop Butler: rejoinder of a Lucretian: Lord Bacon as umpire, 263–273.

Definition of philosophy as the only accepted, available and desirable umpire between science and religion, 273–275. Aim and goal of philosophy in the great reconciliation, 276. The true philosophical spirit neither intrudes into science nor into religion, mediates by no visible authority, and is itself only recruited from the ranks of science and religion, 277, 278.

Refutation of objections,—that the philosopher himself must be a somewhat prejudiced judge: that the scientist or religionist is competent to draw his own inferences: that either can do the work of the philosopher: that the supposed reconciliation is fallible and impracticable: Qualifications and issues of the great umpirage, 278–286.

CHAPTER II.

THE POSITIVE PHILOSOPHY OR THEORY OF NESCIENCE.

The three philosophical theories and systems of science and religion. The Positive philosophy, as held by its leading advocates, would ignore a divine revelation, and with it the whole superstructure of the theological and metaphysical sciences. Not to be refuted on theological nor on metaphysical grounds, but upon its own premises, 288–290. Its distinctive feature is its supposed law of a historical evolution of the sciences: preliminary objection that such a law, if it exist, must be subordinate to other and higher social laws, 291.

Statement of the law of triple evolution—the theological stage of human knowledge; the metaphysical stage; the positive, or strictly scientific stage, 292–296.

No empirical proof of such a law either in the experience of the individual or of the race. Neither theology nor metaphysics on the decline in modern history. The supposed law does not hold outside of Christian nations, nor in the psychical sciences, nor even in the few physical sciences, to which Comte would limit our knowledge. Astronomy and terrestrial physics are still practically pervaded by the theological and the metaphysical spirit. The three alleged stages are found actually co-existing at the present day in the foremost nations and in the most advanced sciences, 296–303.

No rational proof of such a law in the intellectual or moral constitution. The positive tendency to refer phenomena to laws is not incompatible with the theological tendency to refer them also to God as their cause. On the contrary, laws require a lawgiver. Logical consistency of astronomy and of social science with

theology. Every advance of positive science only increases its rational need of theology, 303–306. No moral antagonism of the two tendencies: the religious sentiments could never be supplanted by positive science, but are only invigorated by it: even in the moral world an absolute reign of law would not extinguish either the need or instinct of prayer, 307–309. No social antagonism of the two tendencies: theological opinions must ever constitute the practical basis of social order, 310. The same reasoning applicable to the metaphysical spirit, 311.

Positivism a self-refuting theory. It is a lesson to the metaphysician that no one method of inquiry can be exclusively pursued; and to the theologian, that the idea of a God is intellectually as well as morally indispensable, 312–314.

CHAPTER III.

THE ABSOLUTE PHILOSOPHY OR THEORY OF OMNISCIENCE.

Its claims as estimated by German, English and French philosophers. Singular position of religious thinkers with regard to it, 315, 316. The five problems of the Absolute, which are of fundamental importance in both science and religion, 317.

Is the Absolute conceivable? Refutation of the opinion that, though credible, it is inconceivable. Such a view destructive of faith as well as thought. Different senses of the inconceivable. The Absolute, while surpassing thought, does not extinguish it in contradictions. Perfect logical consistency of the conception of an Infinite and Absolute Spirit as the creator of the universe, 317–324.

Is the Absolute credible? Refutation of the opinion that, though conceivable, it is incredible as an objective reality: its credibility based upon its conceivability as an instinctive conviction, which is indestructible and cumulative in all religions: the belief in an Absolute God both morally and intellectually necessary, 325–328.

Is the Absolute cognizable? Vain distinction between a speculative and a regulative knowledge of the Absolute: the cognizable as distinguished from the comprehensible: true as distinguished from false anthropomorphism: the logical basis, the certitude, and the scientific importance of the cognition of the Absolute Jehovah as an intelligent and intelligible cause of the universe, 328–334.

Is the Absolute revealable? Inconsistent forms of rationalism: the only consistent rationalism: the Absolute Mind, being cognitive as well as cognizable, may be also revealed: the necessity and the capacity in human reason for a divine revelation: the adaptation of the Christian revelation to human reason, 335–338.

Is the Absolute demonstrable? Inconsistent forms of dogmatism: the only consistent dogmatism: the Absolute Reason, having been revealed, may also be demonstrated: the need and the fitness in divine revelation for such a human demonstration: the fact and progress of such a demonstration: importance of a demonstrated revelation both to religion and to science, 338–343.

The truth and the error of Absolutism: intellectual need of a divine revelation for the completion of philosophy as seen in the extreme results of modern thought, 343–345.

CHAPTER IV.

THE FINAL PHILOSOPHY OR THEORY OF PERFECTIBLE SCIENCE.

The emerging problem of a logical conciliation of the Positive and the Absolute philosophies in a final philosophy which shall proceed upon the concurrence

of reason and revelation, and render human science progressively harmonious with divine omniscience: present position of the two philosophies and of religious thinkers in regard to them, 346–350.

Careful definition of Absolutism and Positivism: their contrasted objects, methods and results, 350–357.

Arguments for their conciliation in a final philosophy: 1st. Their deep roots and long growth in the history of civilization, especially in religion and in science, 357–360. 2d. Their logical combination fitted to accomplish the mission of philosophy by yielding the method, the theory and the system of perfect knowledge, 361–363. 3d. Their combination in such a final philosophy is already imminent and practicable: its prevailing spirit may be forecast as at once catholic and eclectic, intelligent and devout, scientific and religious: its issuing system already exhibits a growing harmony of the rational and revealed bodies of knowledge in astronomy, geology, anthropology, in psychology, sociology and theology, and in the metaphysical and philosophical sciences, 363–373.

Statement of the problems of the final philosophy: their moral value and grandeur, 373–375.

CHAPTER V.

PHILOSOPHIA ULTIMA OR PROJECT OF THE PERFECTED SCIENCES AND ARTS.

Definition of the Ultimate Philosophy as a science of the sciences, derived scientifically from their own historical and logical development, 376–378.

Its construction as involving an expurgation, and a survey of the sciences, and a theory of scientific knowledge embracing all the scientific phenomena of the race and including both revelation and reason as legitimate factors of knowledge, 378–380. Its application by means of an organon or logic of the different sciences, the empirical, the metaphysical and the strictly philosophical, the latter embracing rules for correlating reason and revelation in all the sciences, 380–382. Its consummation in an ultimate system of the sciences, of the arts, and of human society in all its celestial and terrestrial connections, 382–385.

The present age as the time, the Western hemisphere as the scene, and the academic system as the means for inaugurating such a project of perfectible sciences and arts, 385–392.

A scheme of academic studies based upon the foregoing project and arranged with reference to the present and prospective state of the sciences: Educational questions connected with such a scheme, 392–400.

Certainty and grandeur of the ultimate philosophy, 400–402.

INDEX OF AUTHORS

WHOSE OPINIONS HAVE BEEN CITED.

Abano, or D'Apano, 39, 144.
Abelard, 38.
Achillini, 70.
Addison, 137.
Agassiz, 68, 166, 169, 257, 370.
Agrippa of Nettesheim, 45, 90.
Albertus Magnus, 37, 39, 135, 216, 372.
Alembert, D', 48, 63, 260.
Alexander, Archibald, 181.
Alexander of Hales, 37.
Alexander, J. Addison, 100, 110.
Alexander, J. W., 183,
Alexander, Stephen, 148.
Almaric, or Amaurice, 39, 41.
Alphonzo of Castile, 214.
Alzog, 29.
Ambrose, 34.
Ammonius Saccas, 32.
Ammon, Christoph. Von, 220.
Anaxagoras, 30.
Anselm of Canterbury, 36.
Anthony of Egypt, 35.
Aquinas, St. Thomas, 37, 39, 178, 250, 260.
Arago, 140.
Argyll, Duke of, 95.
Aristarchus, 30.
Aristophanes, 29.
Arnauld, 74.
Arnold of Brescia, 79.
Arnold, Villa Nuova, 67.
Arnold, Thomas, 194.
Arnold, Matthew, 210, 232, 234.
Asher, 199.
Athanasius, 33, 253.
Augustine, 33, 35, 56, 145, 250, 253, 256, 373.

Baader, 199.
Babbage, Charles, 252.
Bachman, 105.
Bacon, Francis, 48, 122, 133, 137, 260, 268–271, 374.
Bacon, Roger, 41, 62, 135, 373.
Bahnsen, 79, 85.
Bailey, Philip, 143.
Bain, Alexander, 107.
Balbo, Cæsar, 198.
Balfour, 148, 183.
Ballenstedt, 59.
Balmez, 29, 198.
Baltzer, J. B., 139.
Barnard, 201.
Barnes, Albert, 146.
Barnabas, 31.
Baronius, 99.
Bartholméss, 57, 149.
Bascom, 201.
Basil, 33, 34.
Bates, 125.
Bauer, Frederick C., 78, 218, 228.
Baur, Bruno, 78.
Baxter, 125.
Bayle, 46, 48.
Beale, Lionel, 246.
Becker, 65.
Beecher, Edward, 177.
Beecher, Lyman, 180.
Bell, Sir Charles, 370.
Bellarmin, 43, 60, 79, 141, 256.
Bellows, Henry, 204, 223.
Bembo, 70.
Bergier, 75.
Berkeley, 74, 86, 101, 246, 372.
Bernard of Clairvaulx, 37, 251, 256.
Bernuzzi, 158.
Bessel, 215.
Bixby, 202.
Blasche, 84.
Boccaccio, 82.

Bochart, 169.
Boardman, Dana, 161.
Bode, 140.
Bœhme, 58, 90.
Bolingbroke, 48, 58, 82.
Bonald, De, 60, 80.
Bonaventura, 37.
Boniface of Germany, 43.
Bonnet, Charles, 73, 188.
Bossuett, 59, 60, 80, 225, 229, 371.
Bourignon, 151.
Boudinot, Elias, 171.
Boyle, Robert, 369.
Bradley, 140.
Bray, 67.
Bretschneider, 59.
Brewster, Sir David, 143.
Brown, J. C., 168.
Brown, Mellor, 66.
Brucker, 29,
Bruno, 42, 47, 58, 67, 82.
Bryant, 171, 186.
Büchner, 68, 72.
Buchez, 194.
Buckland, 63, 102.
Buckle, 77, 109.
Buddeus, 145.
Buffon, 63, 219, 252.
Bunsen, the Chevalier, 173, 234.
Burmeister, 64.
Burnet, Thomas, 65, 161.
Bunyan, 121, 176.
Burr, 132.
Bush, George, 188.
Butler, Bishop, 143, 175, 263, 372, 374.
Byron, 195.

Caccini, 60.
Calderwood, Henry, 201, 351.
Calderwood, David, 192.
Campbell, Alex., 87.
Calvin, 61, 99, 119, 125, 144, 146, 256.
Campanella, 42, 58, 77.
Cardan, 61, 70, 144.
Carlyle, 234.
Carpenter, 107, 181, 190.
Carrière, 198.
Casman, 90.
Catcott, 162.
Celsus, 32, 162.
Chadbourne, 285.
Chalmers, 9, 102, 142, 148, 156, 259.
Chambers, author of "Vestiges," 103, 138.
Champeaux, William of, 38.
Chapin, 148.
Channing, 213.
Charron, 88.
Chateaubriand, 80.
Child, Chaplin, 151.
Christlieb, 201.
Chrysostom, 33, 34, 186, 256.
Chubb, 71, 83.
Clarke, Samuel, 74, 86, 179, 372.
Clement of Alexandria, 33, 41, 135, 251, 373.
Clement of Rome, 31.
Clootz, Anacharsis, 84.
Cobbe, Frances, 231.
Colenzo, 231.
Coleridge, 176, 215, 227.
Collier, 74.
Colwel, 110.
Collins, Anthony, 71, 88, 187.
Combe, George, 176.
Comerius, 90.
Comte, Auguste, 57, 78, 84, 109, 112, 115, 117, 288–314.
Condorcet, 78, 122.
Condillac, 48, 73.
Conway, 124.
Conybeare, 102.
Copernicus, 43, 368.
Cosmas Indicopleustes, 35.
Cousin, 29, 351, 359.
Coward, 71, 187.
Cowley, 122.
Cowper, 66.
Cremoninus, 70.
Creswell, 145.
Crosby, Chancellor, 202.
Crusius, 183.
Cudworth, 73, 85, 179.
Cullen, 145.
Cumming, 81, 163.
Cuvier, 157, 161, 162, 369.
Cyprian, 33.
Cyril of Alexandria, 33.
Cyril of Jerusalem, 33.

Dana, 63, 159, 369.
Danæus, 91.
Dante, 37, 82.
Davis, A. J , 76.
Dawson, 63, 105, 158, 174.
Darwin, Erasmus, 202, 255.
Darwin, Charles, 104, 167, 255.
Delitzsch, 154, 167, 176.
De Luc, 65, 157.
De Maille, 67.
Democritus, 249, 270.
De Morgan, 62.
Derham, 149.
Descartes, 47, 73, 107, 138, 249.
De Wette, 181, 228.
De Sérres, 157.
Dick, Thomas, 140.
Diderot, 48, 63, 83.
Dinant, David, 39.
Dodwell, 179, 187.

Döllinger, 194.
Dorner, 81, 143.
Dove, Patrick, 194.
Draper, 29, 57, 110, 233, 258.
Drummond, 159, 165.
Drew, 189.
Dubois, Raymond, 118, 197.
Duncan, Henry, 151.
Duns Scotus, 37, 256, 373.
Durant of Clermont, 41.

Ebrard, 57, 81.
Edgeworth, 204.
Edkins, 173.
Edmonds, 76.
Edwards, Jonathan, 177, 182, 371.
Eichorn, 218, 220, 228.
Elam, 181.
Emmons, Nathaniel, 180.
Epicurus, 249.
Epinois, De l', 60.
Erasmus, 45, 121.
Erdmann, 29.
Erigena, John Scotus, 36, 38, 41, 373.
Ernesti, 228.
Euripides, 30.
Eusebius, 31, 33, 145.

Faber, 171.
Fabricius, 148.
Fairbairn, 200.
Fairholme, 155.
Faraday, 9, 278.
Farrar, 7.
Farley, 223.
Fenelon, 87.
Ferrier, 352.
Feuerbach, 72, 84.
Fechner, 260.
Ficinus, 73.
Fichte, 117, 326.
Fichte, I. H., 177.
Filmer, 192.
Finney, 180.
Fisher, George P., 110, 213.
Fiske, John, 288.
Fitzgerald, 62.
Fontanelle, 58.
Forbes, 61.
Forster, 179.
Foscarinus, 140.
Fourier, 254.
Fourier, Charles, 124.
Fowle, 232.
Fox, 112.
Flatt, 87.
Flint, 196.
Fludd, 90.
Fracastoro, 65.
Frohschammer, 179.
Fromundus, 60.
Frothingham, 213.

Gabler, 228.
Gale, 91.
Galileo, 43, 47.
Gassendi, 73, 249.
Generelli, 63, 65, 125.
Gerlach, 103.
Geulinx, 74, 180.
Gibbon, 48, 77.
Gibson, Stanley, 232.
Gieseler, 29.
Gill, John, 253.
Gill, Wm. J., 178.
Gillette, 213.
Gladstone, 159.
Glanville, 230.
Gliddon, 67.
Godwin, Parke, 118.
Godwin, William, 77.
Goëthe, 121.
Goodwin, 217.
Göschel, 87, 185.
Gosse, J. P., 160.
Gray, Asa, 104, 105.
Green, William H., 172.
Greg, 234.
Gregory, Daniel S., 182.
Gregory of Nanzianzum, 33.
Gregory of Nyssa, 33.
Greville, 58.
Grote, 123, 183, 251.
Grotius, 371.
Ground, 200.
Grove, 251.
Guizot, 29.
Günther, 178.
Guyon, 151.
Guyot, 63, 139, 158, 369.

Haeckel, 68, 115, 118, 255.
Hallam, 29.
Halley, 147.
Hamilton, Sir W., 133, 226, 317–324, 346.
Harbaugh, 183.
Harcourt, 171.
Hardwicke, 196.
Hartley, 73, 107.
Hartmann, 79, 85, 326.
Harrison, Frederick, 112.
Haven, 181.
Heard, 178.
Hedge, 223.
Hegel, 117, 224, 326, 335–337.
Helmholtz, 148, 229, 251.
Helmont, 73, 90.
Helvetius, 48, 71.
Hemans, 204.
Henderson, 80.

Hengstenberg, 87, 100, 146, 157.
Henry, 246.
Hensel, 61.
Henslow, 168, 371.
Herbart, 260.
Herbert of Cherbury, 46, 82.
Hermas, 31.
Hermias, 31.
Herschell, Sir John, 140, 249, 368.
Herschell, Sir William, 140, 368.
Hettinger, 57, 75, 87.
Hierocles, 32.
Hilaire, Geoffrey St., 219, 252.
Hinton, 201.
Hitchcock, 63, 151, 190.
Hobbes, 46, 77, 82, 88.
Hodge, Charles, 105, 108, 116, 172, 177, 183.
Holbach, D', 48, 63, 72.
Hollman, 61.
Holyoake, 124.
Hooke, 100.
Hooker, 255.
Hopkins, 182.
Horace, 255.
Horne, 61.
Horsely, 61, 146.
Howe, 125.
Hudibras, 62.
Huet, 229.
Hughes, 218.
Hugh of St. Victor, 37.
Humboldt, Alexander, 64, 98, 101, 253.
Humboldt, Wilhelm, 257.
Hume, 48, 71, 83.
Hutton, 63, 101.
Hutchinson, 61.
Huxley, 61, 67, 107, 112, 115, 118, 124, 159, 255.
Huygens, 140.

Ignatius, 33.
Inchofer, 60.
Inman, Thomas, 112.
Irenæus, 245.
Irving, David, 248.

Jacobi, 85.
Jacobus, 69, 156.
Jerome, 33, 34, 145, 258.
Johnes, 173.
Johnson, Dr. Samuel, 246.
Johnson, Samuel, 112.
Jones, Bence, 107.
Jones, Sir William, 143, 356.
Jowett, 220, 223, 232.
Justin Martyr, 32, 33, 34, 373.
Juvenal, 169.

Kalisch, 217.
Kant, 177, 222, 226, 230, 249, 325–327.
Kaulich, 198.
Keble, John, 184.
Keerl, 156, 167.
Keil, 103, 106.
Kepler, 43, 46, 368.
Kingsley, 124, 213, 223.
Kirby, 155, 175.
Kirwan, 65.
Klausing, 61.
Knapp, 87, 100.
Knox, 125.
Krauth, 99, 179.
Kurtz, 106, 141, 148, 154.

Lactantius, 33, 34, 178, 258.
Lalande, 59.
Lamarck, 103, 252.
La Mettrie, 72, 83.
Lanfranc, 36.
Lange, 57.
Lange, F. A., 57, 140, 168, 183, 189.
Laplace, 59, 98, 249.
Lartet, 257.
Latham, 173,
Laud, 80, 192,
Layton, 187.
Leibnitz, 46, 100, 252, 372.
Lechler, 57.
Lecky, 57.
Le Clerc, 169.
Le Conte, 201.
Leland, 86, 259.
Leo, 81.
Leroux, 112.
Leslie, J. Peter, 104.
Lessing, 79, 85, 228.
Lewes, 118, 288.
Lewis, Tayler, 99, 139, 168, 202.
Linnæus, 370.
Locke, 73, 258.
Lombard, Peter, 36, 253, 256.
Lord, W. W., 184.
Lord, David, 66.
Lotze, 197.
Lowell, J. Russell, 204.
Lovering, 99.
Lubbock, 67.
Lucian, 32.
Lucretius, 263, 266.
Luthardt, 57, 75.
Luther, 61, 119, 124, 185.
Lyell, Sir Charles, 101, 104.
Lussac, 75.

McCausland, 170, 172.
McCosh, 201, 202.

Macdonald, 183.
McFarlane, 66, 155.
Machiavelli, 76.
Maillet, 66.
Mäinlander, 189.
Mädler, 140, 368.
Mackay, 112.
Mahan, 196.
Malebranche, 74, 86, 182.
Mandeville, 48, 71.
Manning, 192.
Mansel, 226, 338–341.
Marheineke, 87, 223, 316.
Marini, 60.
Martensen, 178, 198.
Martin, Theodore, 57, 137.
Martineau, 198.
Masson, 350.
Maudsley, 99, 107, 181, 258.
Maurice, F. D., 124, 214, 223, 246.
Mather, 162.
Medici, 121.
Mede, 148.
Meier, 183.
Meyer, 81.
Melancthon, 61, 125, 141.
Mendelssohn, 121.
Mettrie, De la, 71.
Michaelis, 169, 218.
Michelet, Carl, 59, 84.
Michelis, 160.
Mill, J. Stuart, 107, 109, 118, 296.
Miller, Hugh, 157, 166, 369.
Miller, John, 187.
Miller, Samuel, 193.
Milton, 214.
Milman, 29.
Mitchel, Ormsby, 138, 368.
Mitchel, Walter, 105.
Mivart, St. George, 169, 203.
Moffat, J. C., 196.
Moleschott, 72, 258.
Möller, 61.
Molloy, 156.
Molière, 121.
Monboddo, or Burnet, 103, 255.
Montaigne, 83, 214.
Montesquieu, 77.
More, Henry, 73, 91.
Morgan, De, 62.
Morgan, Lewis, 174.
Morgan, Thomas, 89.
Morris, 201.
Morse, 217.
Morton, 257.
Müller, Johannes, 177.
Müller, Julius, 189.
Müller, Max, 113, 173, 259.
Murphy, John, 100.
Murphy, J. J., 201.
Naudè, 29, 77.
Neville, 159.
Neander, 29, 81, 110.
Newman, Francis, 89.
Newman, J. Henry, 110, 192.
Newton, 44, 140, 147, 368.
Nipho, 67.
Nieuwentyt, 137, 372.
Norris, 74.
Nott, 67, 157.

Occam, William of, 41.
Orr, 218.
Owen, John, 61, 125, 256.
Owen, Richard, 166.
Owen, Rob. Dale, 79.

Pachomius, 35.
Paine, 57.
Painter, 200.
Paley, 91, 214, 219, 259.
Palgrave, 197.
Palissy, 65.
Palmer, 196.
Paracelsus, 73.
Parker, Theodore, 89, 112, 259.
Pascal, 74, 86, 215.
Patrick, Bishop, 145.
Patton, 113, 278.
Paulus, 218, 220, 228.
Peabody, Andrew, 202, 205.
Penn, Granville, 64, 155.
Petrarch, 82.
Peyrère, 67, 169.
Philo, the Jew, 212, 250.
Pianciani, 158.
Picton, 198.
Pike, 61.
Picus of Mirandola, 42, 73.
Pirie, 197.
Pitt, 227.
Pitts, 187.
Plato, 33.
Pliny the Younger, 32.
Plutarch, 30, 32.
Ploucquet, 75.
Poiret, 90, 151.
Poisson, 252.
Polignac, 87.
Pomponatius, 46, 57, 70, 82.
Poole, Reginald, 171.
Pope, Alexander, 83.
Porta, 62, 82.
Porter, Noah, 201.
Pouchet, F. A., 99.
Powell, Baden, 57, 214, 217, 232.
Pratt, 102.
Price, Richard, 177.
Prichard, 370.
Prideaux, 81, 225.

Priestley, 187.
"Primeval Man," Author of, 170, 173.
Proudhon, 79, 211.
Prout, 370.
Pusey, 157, 184.

Raleigh, 174.
Ramus, 42.
Ray, 149, 369.
Raymond, Lully, 41.
Reimarus, 89.
Reinsch, 156.
Rémusat, Charles de, 187.
Reuchlin, 45, 90,
Reusch, 160.
Richard of St. Victor, 37.
Rigg, 213.
Ritter, 369.
Röhr, 213, 230.
Rogers, 104.
Roget, 370.
Rolleston, 173.
Rorison, 217.
Roscelin, 38.
Rosenmuller, 99.
Róthe, 81, 181.
Rougemont, Frederick de, 139, 154.
Rousseau, 78.
Rouse, 125.
Ruge, 78.

St. Clair, 169.
Saintes, 213.
St. Hilaire, (see Geoffrey Hilaire.) 219.
St. Simon, 112, 124.
St. Victor, 253.
Sandeman, 180.
Schaff, Philip, 29.
Schaafhausen, 255.
Schelling, 177, 326.
Scheuchzer, 162.
Schleicher, 174, 257.
Schleiden, 64.
Schleiermacher, 181, 210, 213, 217.
Schlegel, Frederick Von, 167.
Schomberg, 81.
Scholten, 201.
Schopenhauer, 85, 117, 326.
Schoppius, 60.
Schubert, 138, 154, 177.
Scilla, 63.
Scotus, (see Duns, Erigena).
Sidgwick, 156, 183.
Semler, 228.
Seneca, 30, 32.
Servetus, 47.
Severian, 34.
Sewell, 204.
Shairpe, 203.
Shaftesbury, 48, 58, 121.
Shakspeare, 48.
Shelly, 190.
Simon of Tournay, 39.
Sinclair, 204.
Sismondi, 29.
Smalley, 180.
Smith, Goldwin, 175.
Smith, Henry B., 201.
Smith, John, 74.
Smith, John Pye, 63, 156, 169.
Smith, Stanhope, 105.
Smyth, Piazzi, 171.
Socinus, 86.
Socrates, 29.
Somerset, Duke of, 232.
Southall, 172.
Spencer, Herbert, 99, 109, 115, 118, 123.
Spener, 116.
Spenser, 121.
Spinoza, 46.
Stanley, A. P., 247.
"Stars and Angels," author of, 330.
Stillingfleet, 102.
Steffens, 220.
Stone, 230.
Steinbart, 182.
Stephen, Leslie, 213.
Stevens, 257.
Strabo, 250.
Strauss, David, 59, 64, 68, 78, 84.
Stuart, Moses, 66.
Styles, 171.
Suarez, 256.
Sully, 183.
Sumner, Archbishop, 69, 102.
Swedenborg, 152, 199.
Sylvester, II., 39, 62.
Symmes, 129.
"Stars and Earth," 142.

Tacitus, 32.
Taine, 121.
Tait, 148, 183.
Tappan, 190.
Tatian, 31.
Taylor, Henry, 180.
Taylor, Isaac, 188.
Telesius, 42.
Tenneman, 29.
Tennyson, 185, 186, 220.
Tertullian, 31, 33, 356.
Tholuck, 87, 100, 116, 140.
Thomson, Sir William, 115.
Thompson, poet, 162.
Trench, R. C., 146.
Temple, Bishop, 200.
Trendelenberg, 350.

Tulloch, 203, 213.
Turrettin, 61.
Tyndale, 185.
Tyndall, 99, 107, 115, 124, 251.

Ueberweg, 29.
Ulrici, 75, 113, 350.
Usher, 68, 144, 252.

Vallisnieri, 63, 65.
Vane, Sir Henry, 80.
Vanini, 42, 47, 82.
Vayer, de la Mothe, 46, 83, 88.
Veith, Emanuel, 155.
Vesalius, 47.
Vestiges, author of, 103, 138.
Vico, 258, 371.
Vincent de Beauvais, 216.
Virchow, 118.
Virgilius, Polydore, 43, 68.
Vogt, 64, 72.
Volney, 77.
Voltaire, 48, 63, 83.

Warburton, 86.
Wagner, Andrew, 156.
Wagner, Rudolph, 75, 183.
Wallace, Alfred, 255.
Walworth, 161.
Warrington, 156.
Wayland, 181.
Webster, Daniel, 215.
Weigel, 90.
Weis, 350.
Weisse, 143, 185.
Wegscheider, 230.
Werner, 252.
Wessel, 45.
Wesley, John, 62, 116.
Westmeyer, 154.
Westropp, 257.
Westminster Divines, 253.
Wharton, 198.
Whately, 186.
Whedon, 180.
Whewell, 138, 215, 248, 368.
Whitby, 148.
Whiston, 65, 147, 161.
White, Andrew, 57, 233.
Whitehurst, 153.
Wieseler, 146.
Wiseman, 156, 184.
Wilkins, 140, 175.
William, 65.
Winchell, 168.
Wolf, 75, 179, 181, 194, 235, 243, 283.
Woodward, 121, 124, 390.
Wollaston, 48, 89, 228.
Worthington, 161.
Wordsworth, 177, 216.
Woolner, 179.
Wright, Chauncey, 217.
Wutke, 182.
Wyman, 217.

Youmans, 118, 123.
Young, Edward, 141, 190.
Young, George, 155.

Zeising, 201.
Zeller, 29, 350.
Zöckler, 149, 152, 201.

PHILOSOPHIA ULTIMA:

OR SCIENCE OF THE SCIENCES.

VOLUME I.,

AN HISTORICAL AND CRITICAL INTRODUCTION ON THE FINAL PHILOSOPHY AS ISSUING FROM THE HARMONY OF SCIENCE AND RELIGION.

BY

CHARLES WOODRUFF SHIELDS, D.D., L.L.D.,

PROFESSOR IN PRINCETON COLLEGE.

Third Edition, Abridged and Revised. 8vo, $3.00.

The work of which this volume is the revised and abridged edition was received, when it was published several years ago, with a degree of favor rarely accorded to a book of its class. It was pronounced by both foreign and American critics to be a most important contribution to advanced philosophical thought, so clear in its treatment of abstruse questions, and so attractive in its style as to win the sympathy and interest of the general reader from the outset. Dr. Shields has remodelled and rewritten the work, and in its new and more condensed form it will appeal even to a wider constituency.

EXTRACTS FROM FOREIGN JOURNALS.

"The noble enthusiasm of the author makes a thoroughly pure impression upon the reader, since even though one should find occasion for extended doubt and dissent, one must still be delighted, not only by his distinguished learning, his comprehensive, clear judgment, and his lucid expository method, but also by his devout feeling and his warm heart. It is moreover a matter of peculiar interest at the present moment, that the great problem of this work should have been grasped in America, and particularly by our author, who devotes a portion of his treatise to the indications that the western hemisphere as well as the present age can alone fulfill the conditions of the Final Philosophy."—*Gottingischen Gelehrten Anzeigen* (Hanover).

"With the wide reading of a polyhistor, our author gathers materials from every related department of knowledge for a true encyclopædia of the philosophical sciences. The philosopher is for him simply one who, with open, free glance and without prejudice, seeks and loves the truth, whether it be natural or revealed. * * * We may commend this encyclopædical book as a real enrichment of philosophical and religious-philosophical literature."—*Literarische Rundschau* (Wurtzburg).

"In a work of this kind, and with the immense reading which the author betrays in the execution of his plan, a danger was to be avoided. It was necessary to be clear, and at the same time as complete as possible; easily read by all without becoming inexact. The author has succeeded in this point, and it is no small merit. Introducing very happily a natural division which sustains the interest, he has opened, as it were, great vistas in the midst of the dense forest of citations and theories that he has accumulated, and thus permits us to traverse it easily. * * * The impartiality of the author is truly worthy of eulogy, for it is evident from other passages, and from the energy with which his true opinion bursts out at the end of the work, at what pains he has been to expound without passion the doctrines which are so repugnant to him. The great number of authors that he cites never renders the exposition wearisome, as it is made without parade of erudition."—*L'Athenæum Belge* (Brussels).

"The first part contains an abundance of historical materials, and shows a rare acquaintance with the cognate literature of different nations. * * * The style is flowing and animated, the learned discussion being often pleasantly interrupted by an apt quotation. Here and there an assertion may provoke dissent, but such instances are rare. Altogether, this part makes an impression which is extraordinarily satisfactory."—*Jenaer Literatur Zeitung* (Jena).

"If the objects at which this Ultimate Philosophy aims are, perhaps, somewhat too broadly conceived, and removed too far into the realm of pure abstraction, yet they are lofty conceptions which it sets before our eyes. And on the way to these goals, right and left, lies so very much that is valuable and consolatory, soul-elevating and inspiring, that no one will repent if, with due reserve, he trust himself to its guidance, and draw instruction from the rich stores of its wisdom."—*Der Beweis des Glaubens.* (PROF. ZOCKLER.)

"Among ourselves, this work may receive an honorable place among the auxiliaries of the church-theology, which is now coming into prominence."—*Theologisch Tydschrift* (Leyden).

"It may claim to be worthy of consideration even in Catholic circles, notwithstanding the different religious standpoint of the author, who is a true Protestant, but recognizes in Holy Scripture a divine revelation, and laments the bitter strife which modern science has engendered against all religion."—*Zeitschrift fur katholische Theologie* (Innsbruck).

"Prof. Shields' work furnishes a promising sign of the industry with which America is beginning to appropriate the philosophical treasures of the Old World, and still more, is a strong evidence of the most idealistic tendencies."—*Zeitschrift fur Philosophie und philosophische Kritik* (Halle).

"The fundamental idea of the work has a high, we can even say, an absolute value,—that of an all-comprehending science, in which the conflicting aims and tendencies of human thought and intelligence are together consummated in a supreme harmony. * * * Without going further into details, we may say, that the work of Mr. Shields represents a bold attempt to formulate a scientific project of broadest scope and infinite comprehensiveness, which will demand the labor of the human mind for all time to come."—*Philosophische Monatshefte* (Leipzic).

EXTRACTS FROM AMERICAN JOURNALS.

"It is certainly a volume which very few men in this country could have prepared. The learning and taste on the one hand and the independence and justice on the other, which are exemplified on every page, merit the highest praise."—*The New Englander.*

"In the course of his work, Dr. Shields endeavors to cover the entire ground of philosophical speculation, and it must be admitted that he has left but few points of magnitude unnoticed. * * * He betrays an extensive range of philosophical studies, a remarkable familiarity with the successive aspects of speculation and a rare power of perception and appreciation of different systems and theories, as well as a transparent lucidity in the exposition of opinions. Whether for wealth of erudition, clearness of apprehension, or perspicuity of statement, no recent publication of the American press is more conspicuous than this volume."—*N. Y. Tribune* (DR. GEORGE RIPLEY).

"This solid and handsome volume at once invites attention by its rich promise, and tasks criticism by its severe thought and ponderous learning. * * * It is full of valu-

able information that can nowhere be found in so compact a form, and there are passages, such as the argument against the Agnostics and in favor of the reality and the revelation of the Absolute, that cannot but be luminous, refreshing, and edifying to all thoughtful readers. He has spent his time well in the labors of his professorship, and he has opened mines of intellectual wealth which will not soon be exhausted. His book is strong and hearty, truly American, and our people will be wiser and better by having it in all their libraries."—*N. Y. Times* (DR. SAMUEL OSGOOD).

"All the topics of the several chapters are handled in detail with an amplitude of reading and reference that is quite extraordinary. Some idea of this may be conveyed if we state that the list of authors cited contains about a thousand names. These authors, too, represent nearly every important line of human inquiry. One is almost bewildered in the rapid succession of writers and opinions, and seems almost to be reading a Summary of all knowledge."—*The Library Table* (DR. RAY PALMER).

"This book of the Princeton Professor is in several respects a remarkable one; and in no respect more remarkable than in the fact that it is readable. From so imposing a title we are led to expect a learned volume, and in this we are not disappointed. We naturally look for evidence of more than ordinary depth of thought, and here our expectation is met. But on such a subject we do not usually anticipate such lucid arrangement of material, or such brilliancy of style, as shall render the subject attractive and clear to what we may call the lay reader."—*Scribner's Monthly* (REV. DR. CHARLES C. TIFFANY).

"It has a range so broad and a specialty so minute as to place it very high among books of reference. It is almost cyclopædiacal in its history of opinions and controversies. * * * Yet, wide as is the territory over which the reader is carried, he is hardly conscious of its extent, so disembarrassed is the matter of all that is irrelevant, so felicitous are the summaries, and so carefully systematized is the collection of facts and opinions."—*Phila. Public Ledger* (PROF. CHARLES P. KRAUTH, D.D.).

"The idea of reconciling and uniting faith and philosophy, so that they may work together toward the attainment of the highest truth is not new; but Dr. Shields has grasped it with unwonted tenacity, has made it his specialty—the sum of his intellectual life and being—and has set it forth so strenuously and luminously, that it may be hoped its actual realization may be greatly promoted by his efforts. * * * His refutation of the Positive Philosophy and Theory of Nescience is thorough and crushing."—PROF. DANIEL GOODWIN, D.D. (*The Churchman.*)

"This is, perhaps, as comprehensive, and in the good sense as ambitious a treatise as has been written on this side of the Atlantic. The author has extended his researches into almost every department of knowledge, and has brought together an amount of information that is really encyclopædic. * * * The position of Dr. Shields that philosophy is the umpire between religion and science is not so menacing to the interests of both as might seem at first sight. * * * This is certainly a moderate estimate of the nature and functions of philosophy, and we believe, with Dr. Shields, that it is the correct one."—*The Evangelist* (PROF. WM. G. T. SHEDD, D.D.).

"His book is written with great ability; it gives evidence on every page of wide reading and rare power of generalization; it fully sustains the author's reputation as a religious philosopher, and though it contains some statements which ought not to pass unchallenged, it is a credit to American authorship and to the institution whence it goes out into the world."—*The Princeton Review* (PROF. FRANCIS L. PATTON, D.D.).

"The richness of language does not detract from the charm—to many, perhaps will enhance it—of a book which represents very wide reading, very just thinking, and a devout and elevated spirit, intent on the noblest aims, from the beginning to the end."—*The International Review* (REV. JOHN HALL, D.D.).

"One of the most candid, comprehensive and profoundly philosophic books of our time."—REV. HENRY J. VAN DYKE, D.D. (*Evening Post.*)

"The author surveys the whole field of knowledge, and displays an astonishing degree of research. No sect, no writer, however obscure, appears to have eluded his penetrating glance, and the views of all seem to be represented with accuracy and fairness. The book is worthy of a wide circulation, as its history of opinion, apart from other merits, gives it a permanent value."—*The N. Y. Observer.*

"The conception and execution is in every way commendable, exhibiting altogether more of breadth of view, candor, scholarship and philosophic insight than any other book we have yet seen from the orthodox ranks on this great question of the day."—*The Christian Register.*

"There is no other volume on the subject of the relation of science to religion in which can be found recorded so many views of leading men, or in which the views of the leaders of both religious and scientific thought in all ages have been so admirably and systematically presented. * * * We do not hesitate to say that Dr. Shields' work is the best historical view of the real or alleged conflict between science and religion ever presented."—*The Churchman.*

"The continuous citation of authorities, and the happy and apparently accurate characterization of different writers, is something wonderful. * * * The aim is certainly grand and inspiring, and no one can read these luminous pages without being deeply stirred."—*The Christian Intelligencer.*

"Whether we regard the intrinsic interest of the great subjects here discussed or the admirable style of candor and discrimination in which Dr. Shields has handled them, we cannot doubt that his work will take rank as one of the ablest in all our recent philosophical literature. One knows not which to admire, the vast extent of reading required to write such a book, or the consummate symmetry and order displayed in its whole management."—*The Chicago Interior.*

"We record only the impression which has been made upon our mind as we have turned over these pages, when we say, that whatever may be the fate of Professor Shields' effort at the great reconciliation which he longs for, there will always remain to him the lasting credit of making an honest and intelligent attempt to solve the most important problem now before the mind of man. His book is one which is as likely to engage the attention of intellectual men as any published in our day."—*The Presbyterian.*

"If a perfectly luminous style adorned with flowers of rhetoric that the severest taste cannot condemn; if an enthusiasm for his theme which often bears him aloft into the regions of an impassioned eloquence; and if a comprehensive grasp of the whole subject which indicates the hand of a master, can create a claim to the attention of both theologians and scientific men, 'The Final Philosophy' will command a wide circle of readers."—*The Kentucky Presbyterian.*

"After giving this work as attentive an examination as practicable, the result is a high estimate of it, as a summary view of what has been held in past times on the great themes mentioned by the author. It is evidently a production of much thought and labor, and will take its place among the most valuable contributions to a discussion which absorbs the minds of so many at the present time."—*The Central Presbyterian.*

"While the rhetorical beauty is nowhere diminished, the second division of the work exhibits more acute, original and logical argument than the more expansive portion already referred to. The reader is cordially invited to a perusal of Dr. Shields' volume."—*Southern Quarterly Review.*

"The author shows himself well acquainted with the errors of modern thought, some of which he exposes and refutes in a truly philosophical spirit, and with a talent and ability of which we see few instances in modern thinkers. We have been particularly struck by his powerful handling of Positivism and Absolutism, not to mention many other topics which he has treated in a very fair and meritorious manner."—*The Catholic World.*

"No issue of the press for many months has grappled with a more important subject or treated it with a more profound and philosophical insight. If Professor Shields has not actually found the umpire which can stand between science and religion and lay its hand upon both, bringing them into loving embrace, he has made the bravest and most successful attempt toward that end. The book is scholarly, profound, and an honor to the institution from which it comes."—*The Illustrated Christian Weekly.*

"We must regard this work of Professor Shields as the expression of an impartial and far-reaching mind. We are accustomed to hear so much wrangling and discord in the treatment of this theme, that we cannot but admire the lofty philosophic spirit and the broad liberality of judgment displayed throughout the book."—*The N. Y. World.*

FAMILY OF FAITH COLLEGE LIBRARY
Philosophia Ultima; or, Science of the
Ref B945.S63 P5 vol.1
3480400027492